

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

IN 1959 Professor Eduard SCHWEIZER of Zürich published in German an important book about the Church in the New Testament. This has now been ably translated into English by Frank Clarke, and published by the S.C.M. in its famous series of 'Studies in Biblical Theology' under the title *Church Order in the New Testament*.¹

Part One is entitled, 'The Diversity of the New Testament Church'. In it the author examines carefully the views of all the main writers in the New Testament on the subject of Church Order. As a result he reaches the conclusion that there is no single pattern of Church Order, but considerable differences. The Second Part is entitled 'The Unity of the New Testament Church', and here he summarizes and seeks to co-ordinate the recurring thoughts of Church Order which have appeared in the individual analyses. The work is primarily a study of Christian origins in New Testament times, but it is not merely an historical exercise. The author sees it also as a contribution to Church unity at the present time. 'A real church', he writes, 'can exist only where, having regard to the problems, dangers and promises of the existing situation, and listening in humility to previous history, we seek enlightenment afresh in the New Testament, not for legalistic reproduction of its details, but to heed, in the light of the gospel, the message that it contains'.

The second chapter investigates Jesus' Conception of the Church. Dr. SCHWEIZER does not accept all the words ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels as actual words of Jesus. In fact he is able to write quite dogmatically: 'Of the Holy Spirit, baptism, and church assemblies Jesus never spoke'. He does, however, believe that he can find enough that can be regarded as historically reliable to enable him to describe what Jesus thought in relation to the Church. Jesus, for instance, declined to claim for Himself any status as a Church 'official'. 'He avoided all the usual titles that might describe the importance of His person. He understood His life as a way of obedience involving lowliness and suffering . . . but He did not call Himself "God's servant"'.¹

¹ 16s. net.

He did, indeed, stand in a new and unique relation to God, and prayed to Him as "Father" in a quite remarkable way; but He did not call Himself the "Son of God" . . . He did not call Himself "Messiah" . . . Who Jesus is can therefore be discerned only by those who follow Him, whether in an outwardly visible community or without it in obedience to His word.'

Jesus was concerned with something more fundamental than creating an organization. Dr. SCHWEIZER writes: 'Jesus wishes to keep men from deceiving themselves into thinking that they can avoid meeting Him by simply adopting a formula, a name, a doctrine, or a method. He does not merely seek reforms, however radical; and so He opposes neither the priesthood nor the sacrificial cult nor the organization of the Sanhedrin. He therefore founds no new Church; for there is no salvation even by entering a religious society, however radically transformed. Even the best reform of Church order still does not achieve conversion to God. Israel must meet God in the life and word of Jesus; all else can follow only from that.'

A second relevant emphasis which is noted in the teaching of Jesus is that He lays claim to *all* Israel. 'No one is written off and thereby enabled in some degree to make his mind easy by feeling that he is not among those that are called. All the barriers erected by others are torn down—barriers behind which the tax-collectors, prostitutes, lepers, and in general those unversed in the law had gradually become used to leading an irreligious life and not belonging to the pious elect. Even the Roman centurion and the Canaanite woman are called. So the band of disciples remains a *fully open circle*; wherever the disciples want to close it, and to have it laid down that so-and-so does not belong to them, they are sharply rebuked (Mark 9³⁸⁻⁴⁰; 10¹³⁻¹⁶).'

These two truths must be kept alive in the modern Church if there is to be real continuity between the original group of the disciples and the post-Easter Church. 'The Church must be kept from the heresy that adherence to a religious

community, a cult, an orthodox creed or a certain way of living, is in itself enough for salvation, without the need for anyone to have that new and decisive meeting with the living God, who calls him in the words and works of Jesus.' And, secondly, the Church 'must never forget to regard itself as a band of messengers for all people, must never "write off" any areas. . . . At least something of the conception of Jesus' disciples, who live, without any walls, face to face with the "world", will have to be kept.'

After this the main writers in the New Testament are examined, and care is taken to indicate how far each remains true to the belief in the 'openness' of the Church, and how far he feels the need to erect barriers of creed and office against the growing dangers of heresy. Then in Part Two the results are reviewed and analysed. It is shown how this two-fold tendency is present throughout the New Testament, and the unity of the New Testament teaching lies in allowing both these two tendencies to operate side by side, each checking and correcting the other.

'The two lines are clearly distinguishable from each other. One is characterized quite early by credal formulas in which the Church looks back to the vital events of the cross and the resurrection; and on occasion, especially later on, there can be linked with these a forward look towards the parousia. The other is shown by formulations in which the Church looks upwards to the Lord who has now risen, and who is present with the Church. The one stresses the validity of God's saving actions "for us". The other never forgets Jesus' exaltation to God's right hand. On the first view the Church's historicity is strongly emphasized; it is seen as a continuation of Israel. On the second the Church's newness is emphasized. It is the company belonging to the risen Lord.' The first view is represented by Luke and the Pastoral Epistles; the second by John. The danger of the first is a relapse into Ebionitism, and of the second into Docetism.

Paul is the 'witness who listens very keenly to both sides'. He more than any other writer holds the two tendencies in balance according to each its due importance in differing circumstances. And 'the unity of the New Testament Church consists in its having sustained this debate without breaking up. . . . It sustained these very sharply defined groups in the one Church.'

These findings are applied to the modern Church in which there must be scope both for God's freedom and God's faithfulness. Only the miracle

of God's grace, continually repeated, is its true life. 'This miracle never becomes the Church's own property by allowing it either to guarantee the miracle to anyone who complies with the Church order or fulfils certain prescribed religious or moral requirements, or to forget that God can completely by-pass the Church's organization in calling people to Himself.'

Any honest man can respect a book with which he cannot agree, if that book be written out of an obvious sincerity, with a complete mastery of its subject matter, and with an orderliness and a lucidity which never leave the reader in any doubt as to its meaning or as to the course of its argument. *Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God*, by J. I. PACKER, M.A., D.Phil., is such a book.¹ It has certain great virtues.

First, it sees its problem with admirable clarity. The problem is to relate God's sovereignty, man's responsibility, and the Christian's evangelistic duty. There are those who interpret the sovereignty of God in such a way as to obliterate human responsibility, or who question the relevance of any kind of evangelistic activity since the sovereignty of God has already settled the destiny of every man.

Second, it sees with distinctness what evangelism is. Evangelism must be defined in terms of the message delivered, not in terms of the effects produced in the hearer. Evangelism is preaching the gospel.

Third, it has many masterly sections of analysis, none more masterly than the analysis of Paul's conception of himself as an evangelist. Paul evangelised as the commissioned representative of Jesus Christ. He saw himself as herald and ambassador. He saw his primary task as that of teaching the truth about Jesus Christ; and his ultimate aim was to convert his hearers to faith in Jesus Christ. The evangelistic message is a message about God. It is a message about sin. Conviction of sin means the awareness of a wrong relationship with God; it includes the conviction of both *sins* and *sinfulness*. It is a message about Christ, and in this the person of Christ and the saving work of Christ can never be separated. Its demand is for repentance and faith.

With all this none can disagree. But Dr. PACKER leaves starkly side by side the complete sovereignty of God and the complete responsibility of man. We cannot reconcile them, we must

¹ Inter-Varsity Fellowship; 3s. 6d. net.

accept them. To try to reconcile is to rationalize, to bring human logic to divine mystery. Both must be accepted. So then he makes certain statements. 'We should not be held back by the thought that if they (the people to be evangelised) are not elect, they will not believe us, and our efforts to convert them will fail. That is true but it is none of our business, and should make no difference to our action.' Dr. PACKER insists that his full doctrine of election makes no difference to the genuineness of the gospel invitation to 'whosoever will'.

In spite of all that Dr. PACKER says we find it very difficult to accept two quite contradictory facts. We may be called rationalisers, but we cannot take action when we are for ever balanced on a razor's edge of an antinomy. One thing would solve this. 'God hath concluded them all in unbelief, *that he might have mercy upon all*' (Ro 11³²). Only if we believe that in the end God's election extends to all does Dr. PACKER's position become tolerable to us.

Nothing we have said about this book lessens our respect for it and our indebtedness to Dr. PACKER for writing it. This is a book which demands thought.

Those who are acquainted with the writings of the modern Chinese philosopher, Lin Yu Tang, will remember the story of his spiritual pilgrimage, as he has told it in his book, 'From Pagan to Christian'. He analyses those influences and arguments which brought him to accept the Christian Faith, after many years of scepticism and unbelief. One of the most decisive of these was his association with the church in The Madison

Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, and with the preaching of the gospel which he heard there. The preacher was the Rev. David H. C. Read, D.D. His words reached the hearer with such directness and power, and sprang from so deep an understanding both of human life and of the Faith he proclaimed, that all remaining doubts and hesitations were discarded, and Lin Yu Tang became a Christian.

This unsolicited testimonial to the effectiveness of the ministry of Dr. READ cannot but awaken interest in a new book which is published by Messrs. T. and T. Clark under the title *I am Persuaded*.¹ It is a selection of the sermons preached by Dr. READ, and through them his great gifts as a preacher, already well known in New York and Edinburgh, will become still more widely known and appreciated.

Appropriately enough it appears as the latest volume in the famous series known as 'The Scholar as Preacher'. Many distinguished names already grace the series. Some are known better for their scholarship than for their preaching, such as Moffatt, Charles, Garvie. Others, though with great scholarly equipment, are known primarily as preachers—Gossip and James S. Stewart, for instance. Perhaps it is to the second group that Dr. READ belongs. Certainly the printed sermons reveal unmistakably the gifted preacher, able to face his congregation and make the truths which are real to him become true to those who listen to his words. But the preached sermons, though easy to follow and full of interest, are never in danger of being superficial or trivial.

It is hoped to include a full review of this book of sermons in our next issue.

¹ 14s. net.

Matthew xxiii. 15

BY THE REVEREND H. J. FLOWERS, B.A., B.D., SWANSEA

In this verse our Lord is made to say quite clearly and definitely two things. First, that the scribes and Pharisees are a proselytizing body, and, second, that they are a body of thoroughly wicked people. Since the work of C. G. Montefiore, R. T. Herford, Abrahams, Loewe, and others, it has become widely recognized that the Pharisees were not at all like the portrait of them in the Gospels. As a matter of fact, they are to be reckoned as one of the finest forces in the history of Judaism. True, many of them were hard,

narrow, unsympathetic, and hypocrites. But they were not all like that. It was, to some extent, the Pharisees who protected the followers of Jesus in the first few months after His death. It was hardly the Pharisees, but rather the priests, who brought about the trial and Crucifixion. It was, to some degree, from the ranks of the Pharisees that the leadership of the new body was recruited.

Either Jesus was unjust and inaccurate in the criticisms of the Pharisees, or He was dealing with only a section of them and not the whole body

(which is what some scholars say, but if that is the case, then there has been a most faulty and careless writing up of the story), or the speech against the Pharisees is not from Jesus at all. I am inclined to think that the third suggestion is the right one.

There are several arguments in favour of this.

(1) For the major part of the passage dealing with the hypocrisy of the scribes and Pharisees there is no parallel in Luke and that means probably that it was not in Q. It belongs to one of the latest sources of tradition about the doings and teaching of Jesus.

(2) Jesus here makes very much the same kind of criticism of the Pharisees as some of the Pharisees make about others. Practically every accusation Jesus makes can be paralleled with a similar one in Rabbinic literature. But in the case of the latter, it is clear that the attack is directed against a section only of the Pharisaic party. In the Gospels, the whole body of Pharisees are bulked together as blackguards, and anybody who has studied the subject knows that they were not that.

(3) There is no actual warrant for the particular assertion made here. The Pharisees were about the last people in the world to carry on a campaign of evangelism for the Jewish faith. The evidence for dealing with the matter of Jewish proselytizing is to be found in Schürer's *History of the Jewish People*, II. ii. 291-327. The Hebrews were never, at any time in their history, particularly enthusiastic about welcoming new members to their ranks. Yahwism was a national religion. You were a follower of Yahweh in the same way that you were a Hebrew. You shared in the blessings of religion as a member of the sacred community and not as a private person, and as a member of the national body and not as an alien. The prophets were wider in their sympathies (at least some of them), and deeper in their understanding of God. They provided the theological basis for a world religious and ethical policy, although even the prophets hardly reached Monotheism in the technical sense, not even the best of them. There are reachings out towards the nations in later Old Testament times. The Book of Jonah is a strong protest against the exclusiveness of the average Jew, but it was a protest that had to be made. The universalistic tendencies of it, the way that Yahweh is said to have an interest in the most bitter enemy of Israel, is unique. There is nothing like it in pre-Exilic Hebrew literature. It was the fact that Jonah was believed to be the historical person of that name that probably brought the Book into the Canon, in spite of the fact that its teaching was hardly canonical. The message of Ruth also was original, and that Book, lovely as

it is, would hardly have been accepted as canonical, unless it had been closely connected with Judges, and also was of a polemical character in the direction of preserving the levirate law. Some scholars suggest that the polemic is against the tendency to forbid foreign marriages in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. But I agree with Rudolph (*Commentary*, 10) that there is no such polemic in the Book. And the Book would hardly have found a place in the Canon if such polemic had been present.

There is evidence that Palestinian Judaism showed little or no interest in proselytizing. With the prevailing 'Torah' interpretation of the Hebrew religion, nation and Church were one and the same, and there was little or no desire to open the nation to the foreigner. The Ezra ideal of a pure nation in the racial sense of the term dominated the mind of the Pharisees. Just after the Maccabean period, there was some desire on the part of Palestinian Jews to welcome foreigners. But that was not the prevailing attitude. The Pharisees, in any case, were believers in a separate holy, pure, Jewish nation. If they had had their way, foreigners would never have set foot on the sacred soil of Judea. Isaiah 52¹ is nearer to the ideas of the Pharisees than Is 40. There was certainly a preaching zeal of the Pharisees, but it was directed more towards increasing the religious and moral fervour of Jews than it was towards winning converts to Judaism from the outside world.

A good deal, of course, depends on what is meant by the word *proselyte*. In the modern use of the word, it is a purely religious term. That could not be said about the Biblical use of it. In the Old Testament *προσήλυτος* appears as one of the regular translations for גֵּר 'foreigner', 'sojourner'. Other translations are πάροικος (eleven times), γεώργας (twice), and ξένος (once). *προσήλυτος* in LXX never translates any other root than גֵּר, but it is found in LXX in a few places where there is no Hebrew original (so Lv 17⁸). גֵּר means 'an alien in a foreign land', under the protection of the native power, and, of course, especially a foreigner in Palestine. *προσήλυτος* in the Old Testament refers to a different person from the native Hebrew and from the foreigner who is living outside Palestine. For them, other words are used that there is no need to discuss here. There seems to some scholars to be a difference between πάροικος and *προσήλυτος*, but the difference is too subtle to get hold of. In fact, the two words seem to be used indiscriminately to express the same Hebrew root, and the same idea, the foreigner in Palestine enjoying the protection of the State. In the New Testament, *προσήλυτος* appears in Mt 23¹⁵, Ac 2¹⁰ 6⁵. In all these cases, it refers

to foreign converts to the Jewish faith. In the two cases in Acts it is clear that the persons referred to normally lived outside Palestine. That is not quite so clear in Mt 23¹⁵. But whatever may be the case over that, the primary meaning in all three cases is religious and not political.

It is doubtful what the precise meaning of *προσήλυτος* is in the Old Testament and even that of *גֵּר*. W. C. Allen (*The Expositor*, x. [1894] 267-275) argues that, in LXX, *προσήλυτος* is used religiously, whereas others argue for a political sense. *גֵּר* became practically equal to *προσήλυτος* in the religious sense in P (Lv 17-19, Nu 15). *H.D.B.* needs to be studied with discretion in its treatment of *גֵּר* and the various references put in order of date, before conclusions can safely be drawn. All through the Old Testament *προσήλυτος* refers to the foreigner in Palestine, Jewish convert or not. There is not a single case of the use of the word in the Old Testament to refer to the convert to Judaism outside Palestine.

There is a case which gets very near to this, in Is 54¹⁵, where LXX gives a very wide translation of the Hebrew in *ἰδοὺ προσήλυτοι προσελεύσονται σοι*, *proselytes will pass through thee*, where it may be the religious sense appears, but even there, it is the political sense that is the stronger. *προσήλυτος* appears only once in the Apocrypha, in Tob 1⁸, in a quotation from Deuteronomy. Philo uses the word in the sense of religious convert, but he seems to prefer *ἐπὶπλῆς* which is the classical word for a foreign client. Josephus refers to persons such as Fulvia and Helena, who were in fact proselytes, but he does not use the word *προσήλυτος*.

So that, although we can see the word changing in meaning in the last period of the Old Testament, LXX and in Greek books of Jewish origin in the New Testament period, yet the New Testament is, in fact, the earliest book to use *προσήλυτος* in the sense of a convert to Judaism from a foreign faith, when that foreigner lives permanently outside Palestine. That is clearly the meaning in Acts, and is probably the meaning in Mt 23¹⁵,

unless indeed we have a case of hyperbole in the sense of 'you move heaven and earth to win converts', with no suggestion of that being literally true.

W. C. Allen (*Matthew [ICC]*, 23¹⁵) suggests that the Pharisees are trying to win converts to their own body, and so he stresses one (*ἕνα*). They will do almost anything to make a Jew into a Pharisee, just as there are Protestants who strive to convert Catholics, and Catholics who strive to convert Protestants with more enthusiasm than they use to win converts from paganism. Wünsche (*Beiträge*, 285) shows from Talmud the lack of desire on the part of the Pharisees to win converts to Judaism. He suggests that Jesus is accusing them of trying to win converts to their own sect. But there is no case of this meaning of the word *προσήλυτος* to be found anywhere in Jewish literature.

I would suggest: (1) That Mt 23¹⁵ has no basis whatever in the teaching of Jesus. (2) That it asserts that the Pharisees set out deliberately on a task of evangelism, and that when the converts are won, the Pharisees teach them to be even more devilish than they are themselves. (3) That such an accusation is dead against the evidence we have concerning the character of the Pharisees, the respect in which they were held, and the lack of proof that they proselytized for Judaism. (4) That the verse is an example of anti-Pharisaic apologetic used by the Church as a counterblast to the attack on the Church by the Pharisees. (5) That when there is a battle of words each side exaggerates. Matthew 23¹⁵ must not be taken literally. The Pharisees were not children of hell and Jesus would never say they were. But He was quite capable of making a playful reference to them, and the Early Church could use that, take it out of its context, and make it mean something very terrible. Probably what was originally said meant this or something like this—'You move heaven and earth to win converts to your ideas and your converts are even narrower and hotter headed than you are yourselves. You Pharisees get worse and worse the longer you go on.'

Literature

FOUR large volumes on Religion in American Life, edited by James Ward Smith and A. Leland Jackson, have been issued.¹ The first volume, *The Shaping of American Religion*, is by a team of nine scholars; the second, *Religious Perspectives in American Culture*, by a team of ten

authors; the remaining two volumes have been prepared by Nelson R. Burr, and contain a superb *Critical Bibliography of Religion in America*. A further volume, on 'Religious Thought and Economic Society: the European Background', is promised shortly.² To describe or analyse the contents of the four volumes now available is

¹ Princeton University Press in America and the Oxford University Press in London.

² The price of the set of five volumes is £13.

quite impossible here, but all who would understand the American religious scene will find in them a mine of information, both richly factual and penetratingly interpretative.

The volume on the shaping of American religious life includes a brilliant article by Richard Niebuhr on 'The Protestant Movement and Democracy'; articles on 'Catholicism and Judaism in the United States', by Henry J. Browne and Oscar Handlin respectively, and an article on 'Religions on the Christian Perimeter', by A. L. Jamison; followed by 'A Historical Survey of Theology in America', by Sydney E. Ahlstrom, and historical articles dealing with the period from 'The Covenant to the Revival', by Perry Miller, and with 'The Period from 1865 to 1914', by Stow Persons, and articles on 'Religion and Science in American Philosophy', by J. W. Smith, and on 'Tradition and Experience in American Theology', by Daniel D. Williams.

In the volume on Religious Perspectives Will Herberg writes on 'Religion and Education', Wilbur G. Katz on 'Religion and Law', William Lee Miller on 'Religion and Political Activities', Dayton G. McKean on 'The State, the Church and the Lobby', R. Morton Darrow on 'The Church and Techniques of Political Action', Willard Thorp on 'The Religious Novel as the Best Seller', Carlos Baker on 'The Place of the Bible in American Fiction', Richard P. Blackmur on 'Religious Poetry in the United States', Leonard Ellinwood on 'Religious Music', and Donald Drew Egbert on 'Religious Expression in Architecture' (with seventy-six illustrations).

Richard Niebuhr's article may be singled out for closer attention. He classifies the enormous variety of religious bodies in America—elsewhere noted as varying in the number of adherents from more than thirty-five millions to a single congregation of sixteen—according to the date of their origin and the circumstances that gave them birth, and examines the tendency to fissure among Protestants, arising from successive protests against the protesters, but notes the singular fact that these did not lead in the kind of rhythm that is so common in other fields back to Catholicism, but all maintained the original protest. He notes also the contrary tendency towards unity and co-operation, and even to union, amongst the different groups. The tendency towards union has been particularly notable among groups sharing a common ecclesiological tradition but different national backgrounds, which long preserved their separate identity in America, but which have tended to merge after a lapse of time; but the tendency has been evidenced not only among such groups.

The claim to replace the authority of the Church

by the authority of the Scriptures is shown to be modified in practice by the conflict over the interpretation of the Scriptures amongst groups each of which claims that its interpretation is the only authoritative one. Dr. Niebuhr argues that in all such disputes the emphasis is wrongly placed, since the authority of the Bible is rather prophetic than legal. It has to be remembered that Roman writers no less than Protestant acknowledge the authority of the Scriptures, as interpreted by the Roman Church, and the real point at issue is not the authority of the Bible, but the authority of the rival interpretations. What is too often forgotten is that the error of Rome in formerly discouraging the reading of the Bible has now given place to the most active encouragement of such reading, and to a new outburst of Catholic Biblical scholarship.

Dr. Niebuhr observes that American democracy and religious liberty gave to many churches which had their origins in Europe an opportunity to expand under conditions of greater freedom than they had enjoyed in the lands of their origin, and the result has been such growth as that of the Methodists and the Baptists, the latter numbering one-third of all the Protestants of the United States, while yet being second in numbers to the former. To many immigrants the churches of America have functioned as conservers of the old national cultures, while to prosperous classes they have been presented as institutions that foster 'gracious living'. Dr. Niebuhr will not pronounce on the often canvassed question how far democracy emerged out of Protestantism, but observes somewhat caustically that Protestants have sometimes defined Christian freedom in democratic terms, 'not as freedom from sin and death and as that bondage to God which is perfect freedom, but as liberty to worship as one pleases, or, better, as deliverance from political tyranny, from want, and from fear. The gospel of a love that seeks out the lost and lowly, that concerns itself for the one per cent who are sick, astray, or in prison more than for the ninety-nine per cent healthily at home, is translated into the doctrine of equality'.

For some attention to the remarkable revival of religion in America following the Second World War, the reader must turn to the article on 'Religion and Science', where it is noted that the idealism of the First World War was followed by disillusionment and religious indifference in the 1920's, whereas despite the deterioration of America's position after the Second World War disillusionment has not followed with the same results. This Dr. Smith traces to the belief after the First World War that science could solve all human problems, whereas the revival of religion and art after the Second World War arises from a

disillusionment with science. He observes that 'we most assuredly do not respect science less, but we are far less naïve about its relation to human values'. These words have a message for folk on our side of the Atlantic as well as for Americans.

Space is lacking to look more closely at other articles, but many readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will find that on theology in America particularly rewarding. The author examines in turn the various schools of American theology, from that of Jonathan Edwards to that of the Niebuhrs. All of the essays are written with competence and authority, and the study of every one will prove a rewarding exercise.

H. H. ROWLEY

GOSPEL ORIGINS

That Form Criticism has in its time provided an original stimulus to New Testament studies will scarcely be denied, even by those who have been somewhat chary of accepting the radical conclusions of such pioneers in this method as Dibelius and Bultmann. But that Form Criticism has begun to stagnate is equally true and deserves wider recognition. All the more welcome therefore is the publication of *Memory and Manuscript*, by Birger Gerhardsson (Gleerup and Munksgaard, Uppsala; 30 Swedish crowns), which offers a fresh approach to the whole question of Gospel origins.

Starting from Riesenfeld's suggestive study of tradition, Gerhardsson seeks to determine what was the technical procedure whereby the Early Church transmitted both Gospel and other material. Dibelius identified the main feature in this process as preaching and found therein the *Sitz im Leben* in which the Gospel tradition originated and was passed on. Bultmann spread his net wider to include apologetics and polemics, discipline, study of the Scriptures, etc. Significantly neither paid much attention to the way in which stories and sayings were transmitted in Judaism. Gerhardsson supplies this *lacuna*, and in his first part examines the methods and techniques whereby the Torah, and in particular the oral Torah, was handed on. Weighing his sources with care, he shows how to the Pharisees the oral law was something which by its very nature could not be written down, although some private notes were permissible. He investigates the mnemonic devices, the methods of repetition, the means to counteract forgetfulness and the influence of the schools. On this solid foundation, he builds his second part in which, examining statements in the sub-Apostolic Age and in the writings of St. Paul and St. Luke, he shows the close

similarity in technique and in attitude to tradition between the Early Church and Rabbinic Judaism, arguing that in this work of transmission the first Christians were continuing what was familiar to many of them. Thus the *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel narratives and sayings assumes a different character, which is defined not primarily by the contemporary needs of the growing Church but by the careful exercise of memory and exegesis.

This is too long and comprehensive a work to summarize adequately in a few sentences, and it deserves to be read in full. If the author's thesis be correct, and he supports it most cogently, many possibilities take on a more tangible form. The oral basis of the Fourth Gospel and its possible independence of written sources, in particular of the Synoptics; the existence of parallel traditions which precludes the necessity for the Q hypothesis; the genuineness and reliability of the Infancy Narratives—these are not questions which Gerhardsson considers, since he brings one only to the threshold of the Gospels, leaving them for later analysis, but they are questions upon which this important study throws new light. This is indeed a valuable work which witnesses both to the originality of the author and to the vitality of the modern school of Swedish scholars.

J. G. DAVIES

CREATION AND LAW

Mr. Ross Mackenzie continues to put us in his debt by able translations of Swedish theology, and now gives us an important study by the outstanding Swedish theologian Dr. Gustaf Wingren. The present work—*Creation and Law* (Oliver and Boyd; 21s. net)—is to be joined by a further volume 'Gospel and Church' so that of a number of misprints, the most appropriate is the absence of a final full stop to the present work! It is an important part of Dr. Wingren's thesis that 'the dominant school of Protestant theology has reduced the Bible to the New Testament—operates with a conception which is based on the New Testament alone, and which does not accept mankind's pre-history and the story of the Creation and the Fall as its starting point'. It is his further point that modern (Continental) theology has over-emphasized the second, Christological article of the Creed and has paid insufficient attention to the doctrine of creation and to the first article. Though Dr. Wingren's comments on Genesis are always interesting and often profound, driving one back afresh to ponder Luther's great lectures on that book, one is not always convinced that in fact this is how Christians to-day are intended to read the opening chapters of the Bible, whether more is not read into than out of

them. But as a critic of modern trends Wingren is always worth hearing and not least in his assessment of Cullmann's historicism and Bultmann's subjectivism. He works out the theme of law in relation to a Lutheran typology, but is never merely a traditional Scandinavian Lutheran, has always things of his own to say related to the modern world and to the discussions of ecumenical theology. One of his many sound points is to protest that the gospel is relevant for human beings and for human life, and not just for religious human beings in their religious moments. One wonders whether this topic, and what the author admits to be the difficult conception of 'creation in Christ' is not better expounded within the catholic tradition of which Wingren seems less aware than Barth, and even better in the Anglican tradition, by the theologians of the Incarnation and very specially by F. D. Maurice for whom this aspect of Colossians and Ephesians was so important. But it is Professor Wingren's thesis that this is where Continental theology is defective, and English readers will find this a difficult but thought-provoking and rewarding study.

GORDON RUPP

THE EARLIEST LIVES OF JESUS

In different ways, and with varying motives, modern scholarship has sought to disentangle history and interpretation in the Gospels, and to reconstruct (or to prove the impossibility of reconstructing) from them a 'Life of Jesus' and an account of His teaching. It is often supposed that this critical study of the Gospels is of recent origin; so, in a sense, it is; yet, as Dr. R. M. Grant shows in *The Earliest Lives of Jesus* (S.P.C.K.; 18s. 6d. net), the Early Church was in its own way aware of the historical and exegetical problems set by the Gospels. It was inevitable that those of its membership who had received the education current in their age should be aware of these problems, for both literary and historical criticism were taught and practised, and distinctions were clearly drawn between history (which could have happened and did happen), fiction (which could have happened but did not happen), and myth (which could not have happened and therefore did not happen).

What, on the basis of this background, did early Christian scholars make of the Gospels? The first two Christian centuries are fairly quickly dealt with. Interest is focused upon Marcion and Tatian, who show a common concern with the awkward fact of several divergent Gospel narratives, though they deal with the problem in different ways. The Muratorian Fragment shows the same concern in its insistence that all the Gospels are in fact

harmonious. More space is naturally, and rightly, given to the work of Origen. Here only two of the most interesting points can be singled out. (1) A change in emphasis can be detected in Origen's historical criticism. When writing independently his usual procedure is to show that the narratives cannot be historical, and therefore may and must be allegorized. As the opponent of Celsus, however, he finds himself defending historicity; and is less happy in doing so. (2) The eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus is so spiritualized by radical allegorizing that practically none remains.

The book contains much interesting material, and is written with the acuteness and learning that readers have come to look for in Dr. Grant's work. It seems, however, to have been put together rather too hurriedly. This is suggested by one or two minor contradictions, and sentences that do not yield a ready sense, and a considerable crop of erratic Greek accents. Papias is made to describe the Second Gospel as *ἀπομνημονεύματα*, though this noun is not in Papias's text. The Early Church's embarrassment over the number of authoritative accounts of the history on which it depended is discussed without reference to Dr. O. Cullmann's important article, 'The Plurality of the Gospels as a Theological Problem in Antiquity'. Finally, and perhaps most serious, although Tatian's Diatessaron is discussed at some length, the author does not mention the possibility that Victor of Capua may have been right in describing it as a *Diapente*, the possibility, that is, embraced for example by Dr. A. Vööbus, that in addition to our canonical Gospels the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or some other uncanonical source, was employed by Tatian.

Notwithstanding such defects as these, the book is a useful one, which serious students of early Christianity ought to read. They will learn from it more about second and third century exegetes than about the New Testament. It has been alleged that the fault of Protestants is that they believe Calvin understood the New Testament better than the Fathers did. Books such as this pile up the odds on Calvin.

C. K. BARRETT

CALVIN

The most recent addition to the 'Library of Christian Classics', a new translation of Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, has been eagerly awaited and is warmly welcomed (S.C.M.; 2 vols., £6 6s. net). It is intended to replace those translations made independently by Allen in 1813 and Beveridge in 1845, currently available. Unlike its predecessors, this twentieth century

version is not the work of one man but of a translator, Professor F. L. Battles and an editor, Professor J. T. McNeill, who have both had the assistance of a number of consultants and advisers, three of whom are Professors of Classics and five Professors of Church History. Behind the translation, based on the 1559 Latin text edited by Barth and Niesel, and collated with the earlier editions and versions, lie 'extensive studies (undertaken by Professor Battles) of Calvin's vocabulary and investigations of his Scriptural usage'. For the most part the translation runs smoothly; it will probably be found more readable than its nineteenth-century predecessors. Dr. Battles, conscious however of the difficulties confronting any translator of a theological work of primary significance, has kept close to his text, at times unnecessarily close, and consequently has produced what is, on balance, a pedestrian word for word translation rather than a modern English version. In places the older versions will be preferred. A few errors have been noted. For example, in IV. xvii. 32, *commendat* is translated, 'sets off' where Beveridge has 'ascribes'; and *laute affluenterque*, 'sumptuously and elegantly' where Beveridge has 'richly and abundantly'. In the same section, paragraph three, something appears to have gone wrong with the punctuation.

The editor, Professor J. T. McNeill, has enriched the text with valuable headings to every section, full references to Patristic and Classical quotations, and numerous notes in which the reader is referred to contemporary studies having a bearing upon the understanding of the text. These references and notes will be of great benefit to those who wish to deepen their study of Calvin and Calvinism. In addition, Professor McNeill, whose 'History and Character of Calvinism' is well known, has provided a masterly Introduction which contains, within brief compass, all that an Introduction should—a short biography of the author, a discussion of the growth and development of the work, its place in the history of theological literature, and a critical account of the previous English translations.

There is a bibliography of all the editions of the *Institutes*, a list of all works cited in the notes and a series of valuable indices.

JAMES K. CAMERON

MISSION

In the Warrack Lectures delivered in New College, Edinburgh, and St. Mary's College, St. Andrews—*Christian Encounter* (St. Andrew Press; 16s. net)—the Principal-Emeritus of the Madras Christian College deals with 'the factors in the world situation in which the command to preach

the Gospel to every creature has to be fulfilled in our time' and approaches his subject with special reference to Hindu India.

Dr. Boyd first discusses some of the most important elements in the reconception of Mission which has taken place since Edinburgh 1910, in particular the fuller understanding of the essential nature of the Church as a body which lives by Mission, and indicates some of the implications of this understanding for the partnership between churches in East and West. He then proceeds to his main task, a study of the Christian encounter with the non-Christian world to-day, emphasizing that this is an encounter not with systems but with men, albeit men involved in those systems. He speaks with close personal knowledge of what being involved in the Hindu system means for many in India to-day. Dr. Boyd doesn't offer a theological solution to the problem of the relation between the gospel and the non-Christian religions, though he describes some of the attempts made of recent years to reach such a solution. He does, however, make clear the need for Christ's witnesses to be truly under Christ's authority, with hearts that are truly under His constraint and genuinely interested in people. The final chapter deals with an assortment of topics associated with the Christian encounter to-day—forms of ministry, the place of the laity, and the scandal of disunity in the context of the Church's missionary task, ending with a detailed but not wholly relevant examination of the three Church Union schemes in India and Ceylon. This is a well written, mature, and handsomely produced book in which the reader is constantly warned against making sweeping generalizations, especially about missionary policy and non-Christian religions. Perhaps the author carries this concern too far and dwells in too detailed a manner on those aspects of the subject of which he has the closest personal experience. It might have been a better book if he had dwelt less, for example, on Professor Radhakrishnan's familiar teaching and more on the whole meaning of Encounter in word and in deed.

H. C. LEFEVER

HELP FOR THE PREACHER

A volume of sermons by the Rev. H. E. Fosdick, D.D., is always welcome, but there is one unfortunate thing about his latest volume, *The Greatness of God* (Collins; 18s. net). The unfortunate thing is that a very considerable number of these sermons have been published before, a fact of which no indication is given. Seven of them appeared in 'The Power to See It Through', which appeared as long ago as 1935. Certainly H. E. Fosdick can bear reading not twice but

many times, but intending buyers of this book who have long been Fosdick disciples should check that they do not already possess the material which it contains.

This volume has all the characteristics which Dr. Fosdick has taught us to look for. There is the vivid fact. 'Experts have estimated that a pound of honey may cost forty thousand miles of flying on the part of the bees.' There is the startling saying, 'My father used to say that the chief reason why he wanted to go to heaven was that he might get God off in a corner and ask him some questions'. There is the inimitable ability to summarize a subject under memorable headings. There are four things which explain the existence of suffering. First, the law-abidingness of the universe. No one escapes the consequences of broken law. Second, the evolutionary nature of the world. The upward climb cannot be painless. Third, the power of moral choice. The wrong choice means trouble. Fourth, the intermeshed relationships of human life. We cannot live alone. Christian experience involves a great need, a great salvation, a great gratitude, a great compulsion. There is great advice on prayer. *Pray receptively. Pray affirmatively. Pray dangerously. Pray undiscourageably.*

There may be those who nowadays discard H. E. Fosdick as a dated 'liberal', but there are still those of us who can thrill to preaching like this.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

THE CHURCH IN EAST AFRICA

Christianity seems likely to be the religion of East Africa in days to come. But what kind of Christianity? In *East African Rebels*, by Mr. F. B. Welbourn (S.C.M.; 21s. net), we have a scholarly and always sympathetic study of some of the 'independent' churches which have sprung up in the troubled territories of Uganda and Kenya. It is difficult for us in the West fully to realize that all over Africa religion and life are one, in daily work, politics, or in the deep inarticulate attachment to the land. Many of the tensions which trouble East African society to-day find their expression in religious schism, but 'it is rare for schismatics to be wholly wrong; the mote in their eye may be a splinter from the beam of wood in that of the orthodox; the nigger in the woodpile is often enough there because he is offered no proper place in the house'.

The author, who is Warden at Makerere College, analyses the origin and attitude of various independent churches which have broken from orthodoxy in rebellion against medicine, convention, paternalism, foreign control. Taking a close view, there are some strange aberrations.

When the anti-syphilis drug, salvarsan, was introduced under the trade name '606' it was easily confused with 666, the number of the Beast, and rejected along with all medical aid by one sect. Baptism by post is said to have been practised by another in Kenya. But the writer rightly suggests that independency in Africa can be seen in proper perspective only against the whole background of schism in twenty centuries of the Church's history and of contemporary movements in white America. It belongs to the whole pattern of man's history and not to underdeveloped areas alone.

In the same series—'World Mission Studies'—is a volume on the growth of the Church in Northern Rhodesia: *Christians of the Copperbelt*, by Mr. John V. Taylor and Dr. Dorothea Lehmann (S.C.M.; 16s. net). Here is the African Church in an industrialized society where there live nearly half of the people employed in Northern Rhodesia, one hundred and twenty thousand Africans and thirty-eight thousand Europeans, a labour force which produces the world's third biggest supply of copper. Here, too, there is a multiplicity of churches, and much confusion in a society where inevitably there is suspicion that the missionary, like other Europeans, is part of the Western exploitation of Africa's wealth and labour. There is much of sociological importance in these two volumes, but there is more. All the writers are concerned to show that where there is turbulence there is also life, and their records help us to understand what it means to be the Church in this situation at this time.

DONALD M. MCFARLAN

THE SCROLLS

One of the most important tasks of publicists in the Biblical field is the presentation of the Dead Sea Scrolls to students at Grammar School level, and the editor of the 'Pathfinder' series has made a good start with *From Judaean Caves: The Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, by the Rev. A. R. C. Leaney, M.A., B.D. (Religious Education Press; 8s. and 6s. 6d. net). Mr. Leaney, of Nottingham University, was previously known for his excellent contribution in a symposium 'A Guide to the Scrolls' [1958], and the present book will be well received.

It is difficult to know how Qumrân studies could best be presented at this level. Should there be, in the first instance, a text-book with substantial summaries of the contents of the scrolls and outlines of important controversial topics—a meaty, solid lump of food? Or should the discussion be enthusiastic, fresh, and persuasive, with the author's own views standing

out a mile? The present book belongs to the latter class and fulfils its purpose, improving as it goes on, and finishing with a survey of discoveries in 1961. It begins by saying that it is 'utter nonsense' that the scrolls 'proved Christianity to be untrue'. It proceeds to describe the investigation of the scrolls, their historical background, their teaching, their affinities with Judaism and Christianity. But the actual information conveyed is comparatively little and even this is not always squarely in focus. It is all very well to describe in some detail the Shapiro affair, to inveigh against the alleged crucifixion of the Teacher of Righteousness in still greater detail, and so on, but one can hardly afford thus to let oneself go in a book for schools, with its limited space and with the knowledge that in one way or another quite a substantial amount of factual information needs to be put across. I would plead especially for the inclusion in a future edition of a section on the text of the Old Testament. But I hasten to add that I really enjoyed reading this little book and can heartily commend it for the school library.

B. J. ROBERTS

CODEX SINAITICUS

It is good to find in Professor T. B. Smith a literary executor who has taken his duties seriously in publishing this attractively produced volume (with the assistance of Professor G. H. C. MacGregor and the Rev. A. Q. Morton) based on researches carried out by his father-in-law after an early retirement on health grounds—*Contributions to the Statistical Study of the Codex Sinaiticus*, by Christian Tindall (Oliver and Boyd; 21s. net). The famous Sinaiticus, now recovering from the excessive veneration of its discoverer and carefully preserved in the British Museum, deserves to be studied from every angle. The present volume opens up a new avenue of approach in which it is sought to prove that errors, omissions, and insertions in the text of the Codex have at times a definite statistical pattern. Morton's appendix points out that Tindall's conclusions can only be evaluated if other Biblical MS materials are subjected to the same type of testing. Meantime various suggestions are made—Sinaiticus is a descendant of the papyrus roll and was probably not written in a scriptorium. Mark has been moved out of first place to second in this MS and may have ended with Jn 21¹⁻¹⁴. The lengths of various books were carefully estimated on the basis of an existing exemplar. Some of the alterations were produced as papyrus slips handed to a scribe for inclusion as he copied. Where certainty is hard of achievement the clues provided

by statistical analysis can neither be treated too lightly nor be dealt with in isolation.

IAN A. MOIR

Measures of an unusual kind, particularly the decision to call another Council, have excited non-Roman curiosity about the present Pope. It can be largely satisfied by reading a biography of him published late in 1959 in Italian and now made available in its original English version as *Living Peter*, by Glorney Bolton (Allen and Unwin; 25s. net). The background of the times is so amply filled in that the book might almost be described as a sketch of European history in the last century as well as a colourful life of Pope John. The author, an Anglican, has added a chapter on the recent meeting between the Pope and Archbishop Fisher.

The Bible and the Liturgy, by Father Jean Danielou, S.J. (Darton, Longman and Todd; 42s. net), was originally published in Paris in 1951 under the title 'Bible et Liturgie'. The first English edition appeared in the United States in 1956. The greater part of this lengthy volume (three hundred and forty-seven pages of text) deals with the Sacraments and matters related thereto, and the remaining chapters (14 to 20) are concerned with the liturgical year. The numerous quotations from Patristic texts abundantly illustrate the thought of the Primitive Church with regard to these themes and their relation to the Bible. But the learned author is too readily inclined to see the typology of the Fathers as being in continuity with the Scriptures rather than as being a luxuriant growth which often requires to be severely pruned. It is going rather far to say as he does at one point—'Thus, patristic tradition did no more than make precise a doctrine which is written in the events themselves before being written down in the Scriptures which report these events' (p. 176). Furthermore, although, of course, the Twenty-third Psalm awakens in the Christian mind the thought of the Holy Table and the Holy Communion, it is scarcely appropriate to speak of 'the eschatological typology' (p. 190) of this Psalm.

The latest volume of the 'Epworth Preacher's Commentaries' to come to hand is *The Johannine Epistles*, by the Rev. Greville P. Lewis, B.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net). Paradoxically enough, the general fault which besets all series makes this the best volume in the series! This book contains a hundred and forty pages; the volume on Mark in the same series contains exactly the same number of pages. Clearly anyone with

the same space to deal with the Johannine Epistles as was allotted to Mark has far more room to spread himself. By way of further comparison the volume on Amos, Hosea and Micah in this series has a hundred and eleven pages. Mr. Lewis was fortunate in the space allotted to this volume, and, be it said at once, Mr. Lewis has spread himself to the most excellent purpose. This book has all kinds of virtues. Its knowledge of the relevant literature is wide; its exegesis is always sound and helpful. It has excellent extended notes, for instance, on Our Love for God, and on The Evil One. But its great merit is the help it gives the preacher, by supplying all kinds of excellent homiletic outlines and all kinds of vivid, unhackneyed and really illuminating illustrations. This is a highly successful volume which no preacher will regret buying.

The Domestical Church, by the Rev. Leslie F. Church (Epworth Press; 6s. net), has a curious title. In Ro 16 Paul sends his greetings to Priscilla and Aquila and to 'the church that is in their house'. In the 1582 Rheims Version of the New Testament that phrase appears as 'their domestical church'. Hence the title of Dr. Church's book. This book is what might be called an investigation into the hidden romances of Ro 16. Dr. Church believes that that chapter was written to Rome and that it is not a letter to Ephesus which has become appended to Romans. He gives his reasons for his conclusion in a useful appendix. And he uses the evidence of archaeology and of the New Testament itself to reconstruct the possible stories behind some of the names—Phoebe, Hermes, Epaphroditus and Mary, Rufus, Tryphena and Tryphosa. The reconstructions are more than imaginative; they are the result of real scholarship. The book has all Dr. Church's grace and charm, and is a real contribution to Bible study.

The union of the International Missionary Council with the World Council of Churches at New Delhi in December 1961 provides the occasion for a clear and concise survey entitled *The Ecumenical Movement: What It Is and What It Does*, by Dr. Norman Goodall (Oxford University Press; 18s. net). Even those who know a good deal about the subject will find much that is new to them, while those whose ideas are vague or erroneous will find here the essential information in readable form. The five appendices are a valuable extra in a volume written out of full knowledge by one who, having been a member of staff in both of the organizations to be united, insists that the ecumenical movement is more than the organizations which express or serve it.

Lively Letters of St. Paul, by Mr. M. D. R. Willink, S.Th. (Religious Education Press; 8s. net), is the sixteenth volume in the very useful 'Pathfinder' series. This book pays special attention to Paul's Corinthian correspondence, and the story is made very vivid by being seen through the eyes of certain 'teen-agers of Corinth'. The other letters are more briefly treated, but the main ideas are helpfully stated. This book is thoroughly abreast of modern scholarship, and is usefully indexed. It will quite certainly prove of very great use to those engaged in religious instruction either in day school or Sunday school. The only place where the book runs counter to the general consensus of modern opinion is in its acceptance of the probability that Paul was released from his Roman imprisonment to continue with his work and then to be re-arrested in A.D. 65.

There is a television quality about *The Mystery of the White Stone* by Mr. Douglas W. Thompson (Religious Education Press; 4s. 6d. net), for it is as topical as 'Tonight' and as wide-ranging as 'Panorama'. Its aim is apparently to challenge young people in a lively way to consider the needs of the Church in the new nations of the world. As in T.V., the scene shifts rapidly: a glimpse here of the 'Christian underground' of the Early Church; a sketch there of a doctor, nurse, teacher at work in Africa or India or Burma to-day. Each chapter has useful questions for discussion, and young people will find here something to start them thinking. As the author says: 'It might even lead you to an airport you never thought to see'.

Christians in an Industrial Society, by the Rev. Richard Taylor (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), is the result of an invitation from Sir George Schuster to the author to spend twelve months studying contemporary experiments by the Church in industrial Britain. For the general reader the most interesting part of the book is the series of case histories of men whom the author met who imparted to him their experiences and their views about industry and the churches. For readers actually engaged in industry some of the author's conclusions may point a way forward.

The same may apply to a booklet entitled *Christian Values in Industry* (1s. net), sent to us by the Literature Committee of the Society of Friends. It contains three speeches delivered at the Conference for Friends in Industry held at Manchester in April 1960. Both publications raise more questions than they answer, and both are signs that the Christian witness in industry is prominent on the agenda for this generation.

Recent Biblical Theologies

IV. A. M. Hunter's Theology of the New Testament

BY PRINCIPAL C. LESLIE MITTON, B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM

It may seem strange in a series which discusses recent important expositions of the Theology of the New Testament to include, along with such large and impressive volumes as those by Bultmann, Stauffer and Richardson, the slender and unpretentious book by A. M. Hunter. It is a little like setting out a fine display of cars, giving pride of place to the Jaguar, Rolls Royce and Bentley and then slipping in beside them a Mini-Minor. But just as the smaller car has qualities which make it more suited to the needs of many would-be motorists, so the smaller book on theology (if written by the man best qualified to produce it) has qualities to commend it to many would-be readers, who, for one reason or another, might turn away with a sigh or a shrug from the larger books. Moreover, even among those who read with great gain the larger books, there may be some who, wishing to give a course of talks to a study-group on the Theology of the New Testament, would be glad to find a smaller book in which the subject is simplified, clarified and systematically presented, in fact made ready for use by preacher or teacher.

The outstanding gift of Professor A. M. Hunter, proved by an ever-growing number of most valuable books, is that he can make himself familiar with the original works of New Testament scholars throughout the world, distil from them the essence of their contribution and the elements in it likely to prove of enduring worth, and then combine, arrange, and expound their findings in clear and simple language, for the benefit of those readers who have not the facilities to study for themselves all the original works they wish to know about. His main gift has been not so much to propound new theories as to interpret the insights into the understanding of the New Testament of other scholars, old and new. Indeed many of his books include in their title the word 'interpret'—'Interpreting the New Testament', 'Interpreting Paul's Gospel', 'Interpreting the Parables'. Professor Hunter makes no secret of his debt to the work of others, but the debt is not wholly one-sided, because a great many readers know of and appreciate the work of scholars, otherwise known to them only by name, through the interpretations of Professor Hunter.

In the Foreword to his book on *The Theology of*

the New Testament he makes clear the kind of constituency to which he addresses himself. He writes: 'I have tried to serve my busy brethren by providing them with a brief study which, I hope, will put them *au fait* with the latest theological emphases and insights. Let no one fault me for not exhausting the subject. This was not my aim. . . I have tried to handle the salient issues and to discuss the chief New Testament theologians. . . I have no hope of pleasing the pundits who will give my little book a superior smile and reach for Bultmann or Stauffer'. (Had his book been written in 1959 rather than 1957, he would probably have added 'Richardson'.) Professor Hunter continues: 'But it may help the hard-working parson who wants to keep up to date theologically. . . Is not this one of the things that Divinity professors like myself are for?'

Professor Hunter had earlier written a book with the title, *The Unity of the New Testament*, and it is clear that a deep conviction about the unanimity of the New Testament writers on the substance of their message and on all matters of fundamental importance guides all his thought. But he does not ignore, as some have seemed to do, the diversity of expression and emphasis between the different writers in the New Testament. It is unanimity in faith and hope, not uniformity of expression and thought which constitutes the unity of the New Testament. Therefore we find separate sections of the book given to elucidating the form of the message as it is found in Paul and John, Hebrews and 1 Peter, with a discussion of the methods peculiar to each in presenting the central truth. Some have exaggerated the differences between these writers, others speak of the New Testament as if those individual differences between the writers hardly existed. Professor Hunter holds a happy balance between these two extremes.

In presenting the Theology of the New Testament, Professor Hunter divides his book into three main sections. The first he calls 'The Fact of Christ', and there considers the material found in the Synoptic Gospels. The second is 'The First Preachers of the Fact', and deals with what is in these days commonly called the 'kerygma'. The third is entitled 'Interpreters of the Fact' and considers the contribution of the more important of the individual writers in the New Testament.

'The Fact of Christ' consists of a study of the material available in the Synoptic Gospels. It is noticeable that Hunter gives fifty out of a total of a hundred and fifty pages to this part of the New Testament, whereas Bultmann felt able to allot only thirty out of more than six hundred to 'The Message of Jesus', because he feels that knowledge of Jesus and of His message cannot be separated from the later faith of the Church about Him. Others while not so sceptical of recovering historical knowledge of Jesus, do in fact put their main emphasis on the Eternal Word of God to man rather than on the Incarnation of that Word. Professor Hunter, however, believes that reliable historical material is available to us in the Synoptic Gospels, and also believes that this record of the Incarnate life of Christ is of quite fundamental importance. He writes: 'Whereas the Synoptists set the theology in a historical framework, St. John sets the history in a theological framework. . . . As for the Synoptic Gospels, we regard them as reliable historical documents. . . . We may regard the works and words attributed to Jesus as authentic, unless cogent arguments are adduced to show that they are not so.'

Much attention is given to the names by which men tried to understand Jesus and express their faith about Him—Son of God, Son of Man, Messiah, and the Servant of God (he will not accept the contention of those who argue that Jesus did not associate His ministry with thoughts of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah). He sees significance in the fact that the words heard by Jesus at His baptism were a combination of words from Ps 27, 'Thou art my beloved Son', 'the coronation formula of the Messianic King of Israel', and from the Servant Songs, 'In thee I am well pleased', 'the ordination formula of the Servant of the Lord'. 'This remarkable combination cannot be fortuitous. It was His own destiny that Jesus saw in the Messianic King and the lowly Servant of the Lord.' Knowledge of this experience would be conveyed by Jesus to His disciples, and confirmation of it came to them later at Caesarea Philippi and on the Mount of Transfiguration. After the Confession of Peter that Jesus was the Christ, Jesus speaks of Himself as the Son of Man, and interprets this enigmatic title as similar to that of the Servant. The Son of Man must suffer and redeem 'many' by His sufferings; He must drink to the dregs the cup of bitterness, but that cup was to be the symbol of the inauguration of the New Covenant. Jesus saw His ministry as a Messianic ministry, fulfilling also the prophecy about the Servant of the Lord; and also He believed the Kingdom (Reign) of God to be actively present in Himself and in His ministry. Indeed, 'the career of

Jesus as the Servant Messiah is the Kingdom of God, God acting in His royal power, God visiting and redeeming His people.'

The central importance of the Kingdom in the thought of Jesus is emphasised. 'With this theme Jesus began His preaching; it is the theme of His parables; it is the theme on His lips at the Last Supper. In the thought of the Kingdom of God He lives and works and dies.' There is a full discussion of the meaning of the Kingdom in the thought of the contemporaries of Jesus, in the message of Jesus, and for believers to-day. The mistaken views about it which at times have been widely held are described and criticized. The re-discovery of the 'eschatological' significance of the Kingdom is underlined, and the modification of the original form of this emphasis by the introduction of the thought of 'realised (or inaugurated) eschatology' side by side with the thorough-going futurist eschatology. The Kingdom of God is seen to be not a 'state of affairs' but an invading force, active in the healing work of Jesus and in His other miracles.

It is in the context of the Kingdom that the character of the King is considered, and shown to be primarily that of Father. Also the nature of the subjects in that Kingdom is described. They represent a continuing community, a New Israel, the Ecclesia of God. The quality of life expected of them is seen to be basically one controlled by love. This is 'the master key of the morals of the Kingdom', and by love is meant not a sentimental emotion but 'caring practically and persistently for all whom we meet on life's road, even enemies'.

The Cross is seen as the fulfilment by Jesus of His rôle as Suffering Servant of God. The Kingdom of God which came upon man in the life and ministry of Jesus comes with increased effectiveness through His Cross and Resurrection.

A special chapter is given to the Resurrection. The sayings of Jesus are noted which confidently proclaim an ultimate victory after a period of suffering. Evidence of the reality of the Resurrection is found in the continuing life of the Church, the institution of the Lord's Day, and the writings of the New Testament, none of which would have been written apart from the certainty of it. The sheer miracle of the event is recognized, and also the inconsistencies within the stories, but the discrepancies are claimed as evidence of the central fact of the event of greater reliability than a carefully revised and harmonized account would have been. The significance of the Resurrection is seen in its vindication of righteousness, the defeat of death and the ongoing ministry of Christ.

The theme of the second section is 'The First Preachers of the Fact', and here Professor Hunter

accepts and uses the main conclusions of Dodd's *Apostolic Preaching*, where the substance of the early sermons in Acts is compared with what appears to be traditional material in the letters of Paul. From these there is reconstructed the main outline of the subject matter of the first preaching of the Early Church. Christ Himself is the one central theme, not any longer the Kingdom of God. To accept Him as Lord and Saviour is to be in the Kingdom. The kerygma consisted of affirmation about Him, and a summons to men to be in a right relationship with Him.

The substance of the kerygma is emphasised point by point—the preparation for the Christ, His life, death and resurrection, His heavenly rule at God's right hand, and His future coming in Judgment. This sequence of affirmations is seen to lie behind all the books of the New Testament, and it is these which 'amid all its diversities' give to the New Testament its 'deep essential unity'. Gospels, letters, history or apocalypse reflect this same recurring theme.

Basic also to the preaching of the Early Church was the awareness of the Church itself, the *Koinonia*, the *Ecclesia*, and the treasuring of the two sacraments, which served from earliest days as symbols and pillars of its faith. Within the Church also there is the continuous experience of God's life-giving power in the Person of the Holy Spirit, by whom the faith and obedience of the Church was maintained.

In the third section on 'The Interpreters of the Fact' the four main exponents are picked out for special consideration—Paul, Peter, the 'Author' (of Hebrews) and John. In each the central theme is shown to unfold itself, though expressed in varying words and symbols.

Paul, according to the modern understanding of him, is claimed as, what he himself claimed to be, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and is wholly acquitted of earlier accusations laid against him of distorting the early faith of the Christians by insinuating into it pagan ideas derived from Hellenistic religions. So far from being an innovator, Paul is shown to build his faith firmly on that derived from those who were before him in Christ. Paul's greatest affirmations are those he found in the Church when he himself accepted its faith. They constitute the main outline of the kerygma, and include the declaration of Jesus to be the Son of God, the awareness of the Holy Spirit as the 'Divine dynamic of the new life', the Church as the New Israel with its basic sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, the controlling tradition of the words of Jesus, and the expectation of His Parousia. These all became infused with the consequences of his own vivid awakening to faith in Christ, his awareness

of the living presence of Christ with His people, his realization that in the Cross is the clearest revelation of the love of God for man, his understanding that man's salvation is from first to last entirely the gift of God's grace—'the extravagant goodness of God to undeserving men'.

Paul's understanding of salvation in its three-fold significance, past, present and future, is vividly presented, also its relation to faith, and its inevitable outworking in Christian conduct. Conduct for Paul was never a condition of salvation, but most emphatically an essential consequence of it. The ever-present phrase 'in Christ' also receives careful treatment.

Professor Hunter adopts a fairly conservative attitude to matters of introduction, treating Ephesians (though not the Pastorals) as Pauline, and also interpreting 1 Peter as representative of Peter's own thought and faith. Hebrews is treated as non-Pauline, the work of an unknown author, 'if he was not Apollos, as Luther guessed'. But it is shown how behind different forms of words in both 1 Peter and Hebrews the same basic ideas which characterize Pauline theology are to be found.

A longer chapter is given to the theology of John. The Gospel and the Epistles are taken to come from the same person, and the Gospel is treated, as Calvin treated it, as the 'key which opens the door to the understanding of the first three Gospels'. Special attention is given to the concept of 'life' and its similarity to Paul's thought of salvation as past, present and future. Other words significant for the thought of the gospel are carefully interpreted, 'world', the 'new birth' and the place of faith in the Christian life, the 'eschatological' element (in this gospel predominantly 'realised'), judgment, union with God, the Holy Spirit and the Church.

This concise, compact little book on the Theology of the New Testament sticks resolutely to its last. It expounds in broad outline the main teaching of the New Testament, without attempting to derive from it a system of theology or to press an individual fad. The theology it presents is not a bookish theory, but a living Gospel (as New Testament Theology should be). Its aim, limited perhaps but wholly justifiable in a book of this type, is to provide material not for the specialist theologian, but for the Christian preacher and teacher. It seeks not to suggest original interpretations, but to present faithfully and clearly those interpretations already present in the life of the Church which appear best to do justice to the contents of the New Testament itself. For the particular type of reader for which it is intended it is an admirable little book, not only faithfully representing the Faith, but commending it, and making it plead with the heart

and mind of the reader. One anticipates for it a wide sphere of usefulness, such as its older brother, *Introducing the New Testament* has already achieved, and we do well to be grateful for such

writers as this, who can prevent theology from becoming the arid sphere for expert inquiry and enable it to minister to the life and mission of the Church.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

How the Glow-Worm Got Its Light

BY H. F. MATHEWS, M.A., B.D., PH.D.,
KIDDERMINSTER

'Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.'—Is 60¹.

STRANGE, isn't it? that no one is quite sure when the Christ was born. The very first Christians did not celebrate Christmas Day at all. When they started to do so, in the second century, they used a date in April or May. Others kept up the Festival of the Epiphany—6th January (do you know what it records?). But somewhere about A.D. 330 the Christians in Rome decided to remember the birth of Jesus on 25th December, and that is the date we have kept since then.

Why 25th December? Well, perhaps because in Rome the pagans were celebrating just then the winter solstice, reminding themselves how Nature was preparing in secret for a fresh season of life and activity. They called their festival 'The Birthday of the Unconquered Sun'.

The Jews, too, had a festival on 25th December. After the successful Revolt of the Maccabees against the Greeks who had defiled the Temple by erecting a pagan image there, the Jews in 164 B.C. celebrated by a great service of rededication. Each year afterwards they lit up the Temple joyously, and made every house in the city bright with torches and lanterns. For eight glad days, everywhere was ablaze with lights. Indeed, they spoke popularly of the 'Feast of Lights', and told their children the stirring tales of the way in which the heroes set Judah free. So 25th December is the right time for us to put lights on Christmas trees, and to make our churches bright. We have the greatest of all reasons for this—for Jesus came to us as the Light of the world.

Legend says that on the first Christmas night all the stars above Bethlehem shone, letting their soft radiance filter inside the stable to please the Baby King. In the rafters above, two doves were cooing what must have been the earliest carol. The ox and the ass stood together warming the cold air with their fragrant breath. In the manger the hay was warm and soft, a proper bed for the tiny Child.

But in the corner of the stable there was an insect, wondering what he could do for the Baby

who had been born. It was their stable, all of them; and they all wanted to help in some way. What could a mere insect do? Presently he saw a green leaf, fresh and cool. 'I will carry this to His tiny hand', said the insect. Very laboriously he dragged the leaf towards the manger, arching his worm's back twice every inch. With utter care he made his way, until at last he was able to drop the leaf in the Baby's tiny hand. The insect saw that there was a wonderful smile on the Baby's face as His tiny fingers closed round the smooth, shiny leaf. Soon He was asleep, and the insect crawled contented back into his corner.

And ever since, the legend goes on to say, that insect has carried a light which other creatures lack. It had caught some of the radiance from the Christ Child. You can see on a summer's night sometimes a secret glowing in the lane—we call it the glow-worm.

Did I hear you ask, 'Is that story true?' If you mean, 'Did it really happen?', well, I don't think it did. But if you mean, 'Is there a truth in that story?', then I am sure the answer is, 'Yes, for whoever shares Christ's love and friendship is able still to bring light into dark places'. It is *His* light, but it is *our* joy to reflect it.

Meet a Tortoise

BY RITA F. SNOWDEN, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND

Have you ever seen a tortoise? Have you ever kept one? Lots of boys and girls keep them as pets. Every year about a quarter of a million are brought into Britain. Most of these are just baby ones; but in time they grow quite large.

When the autumn sunshine becomes weak, and the days shorten, and the cold winter weather comes, tortoises go into hibernation—that is a nice long sleep. So if you have a pet, this is the time to fill up a box with hay and nice dry leaves, and put it in a place where the temperature will remain the same. For it is very important to a tortoise to have a nice hiding place in the winter. His hard, thick shell that serves to keep him from hurt, like the armour of an ancient knight, isn't enough to keep him warm, because he is a cold-blooded creature. And his four thick, puffy legs are so short that he can't skip around like some pets, and warm himself that way.

At the end of the cold time, when the sunshine

and warmth of spring come, it is getting-up time for the tortoise—and eating time, too. Shredded lettuce, tomato, and young dandelion leaves make a very inviting meal. A little while ago, I had the joy of watching the oldest tortoise in the world eat his meal of ripe banana.

This wonderful old tortoise lives in Tonga—in the Palace grounds of Queen Salote. He is honoured like a chief, and carefully tended by the Queen's servants. He is called Tui Malila. Nobody knows for sure just how many birthdays he has enjoyed, only that he was brought to Tonga by Captain Cook in his little boat in the 1770's. One thing is certain, he is more than two hundred years old. Once he used to be given a share of every Royal Feast; that is not now done, but he is still allowed to live in the Palace grounds. And when our Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh were in Tonga, as guests of Queen Salote, they went out one morning after breakfast, with great eagerness, to photograph Tui Malila. And then the two Queens and the Duke stood to be photographed with the old tortoise—an honour that no other tortoise in the world has enjoyed.

Every time when I think of that warm, sunny day when I knelt down on the short grass at the Palace to see him and to photograph him I think of the old story of the race between the tortoise and the hare. The hare laughed at the very idea. He felt so sure of his own fast feet that, after he had gone a little way, he thought he would have a little sleep. The tortoise seemed so slow, that he felt sure he could overtake him. Meanwhile, the tortoise plodded on. And when the over-smart hare wakened, he found to his shame that the tortoise was almost to the rope, and that he could not catch him. So the slow, old, plodding tortoise won the race.

God has created and placed all sorts of wonderful creatures in this world of His—and all sorts of boys and girls, some black, some white, some fast, some slow—and it doesn't do to be smug like the hare.

Some words of Jesus that He spoke as He looked round at the boys and girls, ought always to ring in our ears: 'Take heed that ye despise not one of these' (Mt 18¹⁰).

The Christian Year

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT

The Fear That Banishes Fears

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D.,
GLASGOW

'Fear not.'—Lk 2¹⁰.

It is a curious thing that the two words of the text appear four separate and distinct times in the Christmas story. It is thus that the angel of the

Lord greets Zecharias. Thus too does the angel address Mary and Joseph and, as our text records, these are the first words spoken to the shepherds by the lone angel who preceded the heavenly host on Christmas morning. How odd that so many needed reassurance at such a time! There is nothing very frightening in the coming of a little baby, one might think. Had it been a host of demons whose arrival was being intimidated, or an alien army, flood, fire or earthquake, one could have understood the terror, but nobody is afraid of a newly-born child.

We are certainly not afraid at Christmas nowadays. Some of the less sophisticated children may still have moments of awe and wonder, not entirely free of fear, on Christmas Eve or at the pantomime. Their eyes may widen when the lights on the tree are switched on or when they see their first 'Santa Claus'. But we grown-ups know better. Even the Christmas ghost just makes us smile. The angels on the tree are made of papiermâché and have been used, we know, for a dozen years. We have seen pictures of the other side of the moon. Our astronauts have flirted with the radiation from the stars. Sober scientists speak of the conquest of the universe. How could sudden dread fill *our* hearts?

Yet, underneath our gaiety, our lavish spending, our know-all attitude to the vastness of space and its secrets, we *are* afraid. We are afraid in the West of the vast numbers and vast power of China and Russia, afraid of the Robot weapons we have made, afraid of an unpredictable economy we cannot seem to control. As individuals we are afraid—afraid of illness, of missing the appointment we had hoped for, afraid of our relationship with people we love going wrong, afraid of growing old and ugly and lonely, afraid of dread, inescapable death, and, after it, afraid of 'stepping out on to nothing'. Like steam under pressure, our fear grows all the time, just because we will not admit it—cannot, indeed dare not, admit it. If once we did, the dungeon would be unlocked, and all sorts of unspeakable monsters would stalk abroad. Always the uncomfortable knowledge is with us that they are there. While we make polite conversation over the tea cups we are forever listening for the crashing sounds of their breaking forth, fancying that we hear the echoes of their maniacal laughter. When we fall asleep they take advantage, and have at us in our dreams. And all this shows in the stress diseases that afflict us—coronary occlusions, duodenal ulcers and the rest—and in our vast consumption of the soothing drugs.

Perhaps our situation is not very different after all from the poor shepherds on the Galilee hills. They were afraid too—afraid of the Romans, of

wild beasts, of robbers, of poor prices for their beasts, and of ill health. What was it that swept all their fears away in the twinkling of an eye? The angel's 'Fear not'? Hardly! Before the angel spoke a word, they had forgotten all about Romans, robbers, prices and pains. All their lesser fears, even their fear of death, had been swallowed up in the one strong, clean fear of God. The glory of the Lord shining round them which had banished all else from their minds, engulfed them, so to speak, in the one overwhelming awe of the holy. It was not fear of darkness that was troubling them now. It was the greater fear of light. Their road from fear to fearfulness was through the greatest fear of all. It was not to their worldly anxieties the angel spoke. They had all gone. It was to all that was left in their hearts—the right fear of the Lord.

Why our generation is so hag-ridden by terrors, why half the population can only face the world when fortified by drugs, is because we have forgotten the fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom and of peace. Flee from God and myriads of devilish things pursue you. Turn to face God and all the demons flee, leaving only the awe of God. Once we know this, know of a surety that real felicity can be found in God alone, then the dread of losing Him will banish all other dreads, and the joy of finding Him make pale all other joys.

It was to this mingled joy and dread that the angel spoke on the first Christmas. 'Fear not. . . . For unto you is born . . . a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.' When they heard that, and had verified that it was all true, then the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God. What had changed them? It was not that the price of wool had risen in the course of the night. Robbers still threatened, and wolves still lurked in the hills. The Roman yoke had not miraculously been broken. The coming of the Saviour was not to turn stones into bread, nor deliver the kingdoms of the world into the hands of the saints. In some sort the shepherds had the same fears as they had always had, but they were different, for they were seen in the perspective of the fear of the Lord and of His love.

If with awe and wonder, in fear and trembling, we make the journey this Christmas that the shepherds made, the love that casts out fear will enter into and possess our hearts, and we will return to face the problems of the world, of the Church and of our own lives, no longer afraid, assured now that we have God-with-us, Immanuel. Surely this is a gospel worth making known to our fear crazed world.

Trust in the Lord, for ever trust,
and banish all your fears.

For He has shown how utterly we may trust Him by giving His Son to be our Saviour.

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS DAY

Recollection and Re-creation

BY THE REVEREND H. A. HAMILTON, B.A.,
BRIGHTON

'God requireth that which is past.'—Ec 3¹⁵.

Few mistakes which men make are as far-reaching as this mistake about the past. 'Well, that's over and done with' is as common a phrase to expose it as any. Is anything ever 'over', or 'done with'? Nothing is more alive than the past; nor anything has more power over the present. It is the past which inhibits men, influences their judgments, directs their actions. It is the past which separates nations, which can either foul the springs of confidence or sustain loyalties strained to breaking point. Not many things are as alive or as unfinished as the past.

It was a pagan philosopher, not a Christian, who wrote:

The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ
Moves on.

The Hebrew thinker, with truer insight, says, 'God seeketh again that which is past' and is himself outdone by the glorious Christian affirmation 'Behold, I make all things new'.

How profound was the Hebrew view of the nature of history! To them it was not a record of events but a revelation of the continuous nature of God's operation. They knew that the dramatic acts of the past were the incomplete facts of the present. The Exodus was no mere chronicle of deliverance. It was the persistent inspiration of their national life. The words, 'remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt and the Lord thy God redeemed thee . . .', haunt, in one form or another, the thinking of the Old Testament. The Exodus was still going on; God was still leading His people out of captivity into His 'glorious liberty'.

This was as true of their thinking about individual experience. Characters are drawn so as to show the power of God to seek again their past, both in judgment and in forgiveness; as ground of encouragement and as the place of understanding. Jeremiah painted this into his picture of the potter's workshop as he showed the true craftsman taking the marred clay, the failure in action, not to throw it away into oblivion but to mould it again, a better vessel.

The creative artist has always known his

dependence upon the past. Memory is his workshop. In it he finds his new materials, the experiences which must be sought again, 'to be renewed in another fashion'. The Greeks made all the Muses the children of Mnemosyne—daughters of memory. So it surely is. The novelist has his notebooks of observation, the painter his sketch-books. The sculptor recalls shapes that haunt his eye and the poet recalls images of yesterday to interpret to-day. When Wordsworth defined poetry as 'emotion recollected in tranquillity . . .' he was giving a classic form to all such thinking.

The secret of growth in understanding, as of maturity of spirit, lies in the practice of recollection. This is surely one of the urgent tasks of education. It must train memory not in an imitative way, merely to repeat words, formulae, and facts; but in such a way that past experiences are recalled to meet new situations, past images to interpret new facts. How important it is to give every child the sense that all the simple daily things that happen to him have significance; to teach him how to seek again the things that are past, which he already knows, so that he finds he has the key to unlock the door of the new truth he finds it hard to know. Oh, the unused riches of forgotten experience!

In Christian 'growing up into Christ' the practice of recollection is crucial. It is, to begin with, the condition of true prayer. Thanksgiving depends upon it, and memory cannot be too precise. It is in the particular, 'the Divine particular', as Blake called it, that the truth resides; the truth of the nature of God's providence. Penitence meant little apart from the willingness to recall, in the detail from which we would hide, the follies and failures from which we need to be delivered. In this sense, deeply, God in all His liberating love, seeks again the things that are past. There, is the worship of His renewing grace. There, He can take into His hands the marred clay and refashion it. Intercession, too, is vivid creative prayer when it is disciplined by the keen edged remembrance of the details of others' needs so that we are able indeed to see them into the presence of Christ for His blessing.

Perhaps most of all, our relation to Christ is re-created in remembrance. It was no accident that the words 'Do this in remembrance of me' come at the heart of the Lord's Supper. The depths of the experience of communion with Him lie open to those who come to the Table, remembering. What a creative act it is to rehearse what God has done. Visibly to the eye the Roman Mass seeks to recapitulate the sacrificial act of Christ. Yet, by true imagining, recalling our Lord, as He moved among men 'to seek and to save'; as, taking upon Himself the form of a servant, He

was obedient unto death; as, standing in the shadow of death, 'on the same night in which he was betrayed', He took bread; as, 'the doors being shut' the Risen Lord stood in the midst of His friends and said 'Peace be unto you'; it is by recalling these things, seeking by the power of the Spirit the things which are past, that we find we are led into the continuing discovery that the past is a Living Past and Jesus a Living Lord.

We may come, therefore, on the threshold of a New Year, to no wiser place than the place of recollection. All we need to know has already happened if we could find the insight to see it and the power to possess it. If we are willing to turn back the pages of the past in the company of that Spirit of Truth who has the lineaments of Jesus, we shall come very surely to the place of illumination and, in its light, see more clearly the way ahead. Mere brooding on the past is both morbid and painful; it can become a chronic sickness of mind. Looking upon the past with Him who is the Lord of the past, who asks nothing better than to be given the right of entry into our yesterdays that He may show us there the truth we missed, this is to be both made rich and free. Only those who are willing to be liberated from the past can go into the future without fear. Else, the hidden things will rise up before us unawares, to mock and hamper our 'running the race that is set before us'.

At every year's beginning we try to come to the place of dedication. What have we to offer? We cannot offer the future; it is unknown. If we are to offer the present, what we truly are, we must be able to offer the past, wholly, without reserve. This is what He is seeking again at this time of recollection. He wants to take it into those hands which bear the mark of forgiving love and make it again another vessel, more able to carry 'living water'. So, He makes all things new.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Balm in Gilead

BY THE REVEREND EDWARD ROGERS, M.A., B.D.,
LONDON

'Is there no balm in Gilead; is there no physician there? why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?'—Jer 8²².

Some people are happy only when they are miserable. If cold rain falls incessantly from grey skies during their holiday, they will sigh resignedly: 'I expected something like this'. And if the sun shines from the cloudless blue they will prophesy dolefully: 'We shall pay for this later on'.

Jeremiah has a reputation for being among these

dismal jimmies. The reputation is altogether undeserved. He looked to the future of his people with dark foreboding, but he had no joy in the prospect. He preached unwillingly, driven by a Divine command that must be obeyed. He was neither pessimist nor optimist, but realist; a man with the clear vision of the true prophet.

He told his people that the times were bad and were getting worse—and he was right. The old balance of power between strong nations that had preserved the precarious independence of Judah was now shattered by the growing might of Babylon, and Babylon was moving out to conquest. The inner strength of Judah, guarded by the wisdom and justice of Josiah, was corroded by the vanity and covetousness of Jehoiakim. Jeremiah lived to see, with no self-satisfaction, the terrible fulfilment of his grim forecasts.

He was right, but they did not want to believe him. They fooled themselves that all would be well before long. 'Is not the Lord in Zion', they said, 'no harm can come to us.' 'We are wise', they said, 'and the law of the Lord is with us.' Their leaders said the things they wanted to hear, assuring them of peace where there was no peace.

If I follow aright the mind of the prophet, he was bewildered that intelligent men could be so wilfully blind. 'If men fall down, they have the sense to get up out of the mire, but my people stay wallowing in the mud. If a man loses his way, he turns back to find the road he knew, but my people will not admit even to themselves that they are on a wrong track, and they blunder on, bruising and wounding themselves, to the edge of disaster. The birds of the air obey the rules of their being, but my people know not the judgment of the Lord.'

They live in the darkness of pride, too proud to admit that they are fallen and lost. If only they would see the reality of their situation! But what good would that do? Might it not be better to enjoy a little delusive happiness before the crash comes; better to eat and drink and be merry in ignorance than to wait consciously for the inevitable sorrow?

It is best to know, says the prophet, for the disaster is *not* inevitable. It will come if we drift blindly on, but can be averted if we open our eyes. It is true that the nation is like a dying man—but is there no balm in Gilead? The question is rhetorical. He knew, and his hearers knew, that Gilead was the land from which came soothing oils and healing medicines. Why should the nation die when there is healing at hand? All that is needed is that we confess our illness and ask for cure.

I find in this stern, strong word of warning and of hope a New Year message for our generation.

We live on the brink of nuclear war, and still try to deceive ourselves that things are not really so bad after all. We get very agitated about Bingo, as though this stupid pastime of small-minded covetousness were not itself a flimsy screen for many against reality. There are a dozen trouble spots in the world from which the mushroom cloud may blossom. There is smouldering war or cold war over all the globe. Millions of our fellows go hungry, and tens of thousands starve. Poverty, hunger, ignorance and disease have not yet slackened their tyrant grip on the human race. Our machines speed out into space, and our morals sink into the slime. We are fallen and lost, and deny it on the lip of the abyss.

And some who see it can see no help for it. We are the helpless pawns in a game played by vast impersonal forces; the expendable units in the inevitable process of history. So they say, with the cool, remote detachment of a Stoic philosopher—and they are wrong. Refugees do not happen; they are made by some form or other of human arrogance or lust for power. War does not 'come'; it is planned by human minds and launched by human wills. The source of our pain is within ourselves, the people who know not the judgment of the Lord.

It need not be so. 'There is a balm in Gilead that makes the wounded whole.' There is light and life and health in the good news of the gospel. There is a road that leads from a Cross and an Empty Tomb to the high place of man's destiny. There is a grace that conquers pride and makes the blind to see. This is not pulpit oratory but sober fact, attested by that same Cross and Tomb. As this new year begins let us admit that, like the Prodigal, we have wandered far away, that we have fallen and are ragged and lost—and then let us, like rational beings, arise and go home.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Life Should Not Be Lonely

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, D.D.,
GLASGOW

'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.'—Jn 10¹⁰.

Dr. Charles Warr tells in the autobiography recently published of words he saw in the visitors' book kept in a Churches' Hut on a remote Orkney island during the last War. Some soldier or sailor or airman or girl in the auxiliary Services had written, 'Thank you! Here I found friendship in loneliness and happiness and peace in the midst of war. Here I think I also found God.'

Robinson Crusoe is a fascinating tale. How

romantic to be alone on an island of one's own ! How terrible too to be cut off from all mankind ! And loneliness may be felt anywhere. Where so lonely, ran a Latin proverb, as in the crowded town. 'I was never so lonely', said the African missionary Dr. Laws, 'as in London in 1875.' A Sunday newspaper had a whole page recently about the prevalence of this feeling in our new towns and housing schemes.

It is possible to philosophise about this and accept it as just the nature of human existence. So the Book of Proverbs does when it says, 'The heart knoweth his own bitterness ; and a stranger doth not intermeddle with his joy'. Sympathy has its limitations. Mr. Bonar Law, who was Prime Minister in the years when hundreds of thousands were out of work, once said in a speech that the members of the Government felt the problem of unemployment as much as any of them ; and then he hesitated, and in his candid way he added, 'At least we feel it very keenly' ; for of course no one else could really feel it in the same way as an idle man.

This is indeed part of the truth about life. Joy comes or pain, misunderstanding or disappointment and the taste of it is in our own mouth.

The Swiss philosopher Amiel says somewhere in his *Journal* : 'It occurred to me this morning how little we know of each other's physical troubles. Even those nearest and dearest to us know nothing of our conversations with the King of Terrors. There are thoughts which brook no confidant, griefs which cannot be shared. We dream alone, we suffer alone, we die alone.'

The Belgian poet Maeterlink wrote a strange play called *The Sightless* about twelve blind people lost in a forest. Nothing happens in the play. The characters just talk to one another ; and the oldest blind man says at one point words which the poet means in a mystical way for all of us, 'We have never seen each other', he says, 'we question each other, and we answer each other, we live together and we are always together, but we know not what we are. For years and years we have lived together and we have never beheld each other. One would say we are always alone.'

Yes, in the sea of life, enisled
With echoing straits between us thrown
Dotting the shoreless watery wild
We mortal millions live alone.

Now it would be possible to go on for a long time meditating on this aspect of life. But the important thing is surely to understand that this is not a full account of life. When we grasp the fact of our own existence it is existence in a world around us. What is the most real thing in all our experience ? It is the meeting, mind with mind,

heart to heart, with other people who are there. The very stuff of life is fellowship, communication with others. To reject this is in some deep ultimate real sense to refuse the only way of personal existence.

There is an odd phrase in Hosea—'a wild ass alone by himself'. Jesus said 'This is My commandment that ye love one another'. To obey this commandment is the way to reach for His promise—'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly'.

The way to full existence is through overcoming, reaching beyond loneliness into fellowship. It may be one bit of truth that we are each alone, but the larger truth is that only in communication with others, entering into their life as well as our own, do we come into full existence as persons and realise the meaning and purpose of life. And only when this larger life of fellowship reaches out to and includes fellowship with the Eternal God, can it be serene and secure.

The first thing to say to anyone who rebels or protests against the loneliness of life is that other people too feel shut behind prison bars and you should do something to help and of course that will turn out to be the very way to help yourself. Mark Rutherford writes :

I once did think there might be mine
One friendship perfect and divine.
Alas that dream dissolved in tears
Ere I had counted twenty years.
For I was ever commonplace
Of genius never had a trace.
Those whom I know I cannot blame
If they are cold I am the same.
How could they ever show to me
More than a common courtesy.

'I do not blame them', the poet says generously. But are people not to blame who ignore the shy approaches of neighbours and comrades. 'Man's inhumanity to man' is seen not only in active cruelty ; it is often just neglect of the lonely. 'All my friends stand aloof', says one Psalmist.

There are probably quite near you people whose need is not money or advice but they are eating their heart out because no one cares to listen to any word of theirs. Perhaps overcoming shyness some one offers a remark about the weather and we give a quick curt careless answer. Then perhaps with a start we realize that he wants to break the ice and talk, and that if we show a little interest he will open up. Yes, surely that was his intention and we will respond. But already the moment has passed and it is too late. He has sensed our indifference and turned away. We may give even friends the impression that their inmost thoughts and deepest troubles are of no great interest or importance to us ; and so no

real intimacy or helpful fellowship comes into being. But

Wherever in the world I am,
In whatsoever estate,
I have a fellowship with hearts
To keep and cultivate.

And obviously in enlarging thus the lives of others you enlarge your own.

The other thing to say is that when in spite of all he can do for others and that others can do for him the sense of isolation comes over anyone, nevertheless he is never to feel that he is just by himself in an indifferent world. Beyond the universe we see is God its creator putting into it capacities and qualities that do not spring spontaneously from mind or atoms but come down from heaven. Men have thought of Him as like an architect behind a building or a schoolmaster behind the organization of a school. Jesus teaches us to call Him our Father in heaven, One who knows each of us and cares for us and is near.

There is a limit to what our nearness can do for others and which we can receive from them. The only man whose existence is secure is he who lives in the company of God.

This is a deep matter but it is not reserved for the old or learned to know. I always remember a young soldier speaking to me in France in 1917 about his love of poetry and of the Psalms. As he had been walking down the communicating trench from the front line while the ground near was being torn by shot and blast he said he had repeated to himself,

Yea, though I walk in death's dark vale,
yet will I fear none ill :
For thou art with me.

'I guess', he said in his Western accent, 'that verse was very appropriate.'

I remember a little girl searching in a large dark cupboard for a lost toy. Out of the blackness a voice came cheerily singing the line from her evening prayer,

Through the darkness be Thou near me.

There is a great chorus of testimony from those who have never felt forlorn because they knew they walked with God.

Poets and philosophers have tried to express, in words sometimes profound, sometimes beautiful, sometimes rather vague, faith in a power above or at the root of things. By all means keep the sense of mystery and wonder that is there. But remember that all can be contained in simple words like those of Jesus: 'I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth', and can be grasped by the childlike understanding.

Moreover it is not just by Jesus' words that we know. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father'. In Paul's words, we have 'the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ'.

So life need not be lonely. Existence may be enlarged and enriched and be abundant through human love given and received. It will be serene and secure when it is rooted not only in contacts and communications with our fellow-men but in trust in our Eternal Father. Banish loneliness from the lives of others by showing them friendship. Escape from it yourself into the fellowship of God.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

Doing Truth

BY THE REVEREND H. F. LOVELL COCKS, D.D.,
AMERSHAM

'He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.'—Jn 3²¹.

We usually think of truth as something we *know*, rather than as something we *do*. Truth awaits our discovery and thereafter is at our disposal, like a set of mathematical tables. But according to the Bible the moment of truth is always a personal encounter with reality in which we find ourselves challenged—put on the spot—so that we can possess the truth only so far as we are willing to be possessed by it, to obey it and be moulded by it. In doing the truth we become more fully alive. We grow up and become mature persons fashioned in the image of God who is Truth.

A scientific researcher is a doer of the truth. He may be an agnostic, but even so he is a man with a vocation. He follows a calling, even though he does not yet know who it is who is calling him. His passion for truth is a sacrifice he lays on the altar of a God in whose reality he may not yet believe. He has declared war on slipshod work and wishful thinking. He will not cook his accounts or fudge his sums. He is, indeed, the man of our text who comes to the light and submits his results to the scrutiny and judgment of his peers. If he is an agnostic, then for him the heavens do not declare the glory of God. Nevertheless, in his reverence for truth and scientific integrity the glory of God is manifest.

But in our doing of the truth—our responsible traffic with reality—integrity cannot exist except in company with humility. Pride in one's own achievement is natural enough, but in the devotee of truth it is very short-lived. The scientific worker knows how much more remains to be discovered. New facts may topple his pet theories. So he submits himself to the discipline of research

and learns to rejoice when others see truth he has missed and knowledge is advanced through the refutation of his errors. And when we have learned humility to the point of not thinking of ourselves and our work more highly than we ought to think, there is yet another lesson to be mastered. The infallibility we dare not claim for ourselves we may be tempted to claim for our method of inquiry. So the scientist may be tempted to refuse the name of truth to what cannot be made the subject of his experiments and weighed in his balances, forgetting that while the scientific method can yield some of the truth about everything, it cannot yield the whole truth about anything. There are many avenues along which the challenge and constraint of reality comes to us. If we deny this, then the pride we had driven out of the door comes in again through the window, and we are claiming for one particular method of truth-finding an absoluteness which does not belong to it. Christians have often been grievous sinners here. There is many a page of the Church's history stained with the blood exacted by dogmatists who would have shut the gates of Heaven against all who did not travel thither by their licence and along their road. Bigotry, that misshapen offspring of arrogance and fear, is evil both in itself and in its effects, not only on the persecuted but on their persecutors as well. Here, supremely, it is better to suffer evil than to do it. Tolerance is more than a civic virtue that is essential to social peace. It is indispensable to the moral development of the individual man, whose integrity cannot be intolerant and remain unspotted, and whose humility is ruined when it ceases to be humane.

There have been many definitions of religion. Here are two. 'Religion is world-loyalty.' 'Religion is the response of the whole man to reality as a whole.' These two are really one. Each expresses what 'doing the truth' really means. It is more than the way we learn about the real world. It is the way we accept it and respond to it. And integrity, humility, open-mindedness and tolerance are demanded of us all, learned and unlearned alike.

Now the reality with which we have to do, whose authority we must acknowledge and to whose challenge we must respond, is none other than the living God, the Creator of all things who has revealed Himself in Christ as the Father and Redeemer of all men. For Him people matter. He loves us all and wants to make us real persons—mature men and women. He has dealings with us all, whether we know it or not. And whether we know it or not, day by day we are living in His presence and responding—or failing to respond—to His challenge. And because of what He is, and

by virtue of our human nature as He has created it, you and I cannot grow to our full moral stature unless we are concerned, as He is concerned, for the well-being of our fellow-men. So integrity and humility must find their completion in love, and tolerance must burgeon into charity. Doing the truth means living in the world of persons and personal relationships, with an unsleeping awareness of their claims on us. It means doing justly and loving mercy. It means courtesy, consideration, and compassion. As it is in the Person of Christ our Lord that the reality of God is most luminously manifested to us, so it is in this region of personal relationships and social existence that God's challenge and claim on us become most insistent, and our failure to answer that challenge and meet that claim becomes most dangerous both to ourselves and to the world in which we live.

The peril here arises from what we may call *segregation*—the divorce of learning from living, of technology from ethics, of business and politics from religion. Without specialization the work of the modern world could not be done nor the frontiers of our knowledge advanced. Yet specialization tends to separate us from one another and to make more difficult mutual understanding. The specialist—be he physicist, social scientist or theologian—who in his zeal for his own special study forgets his responsibilities to his fellow-men is likely to become a man divided against himself, a moral schizophrenic. The atomic scientist must not be indifferent to the use to which his discoveries may be put, on the plea that decisions regarding this are really not his responsibility. Neither can the Christian repudiate his civic duties in a democratic society, on the ground that politics is a worldly business with which one whose citizenship is in Heaven ought not to be concerned. That 'most excellent gift of charity' is indeed 'the very bond of peace and all virtues'. It is the keystone of the arch, both of our spiritual development as individuals and of our corporate life together.

Doing the truth means living in the real world, God's world. It means being made brave enough to face the truth; and not only the truth of things, which can be humbling enough when it treads on our dreams, but the truth about ourselves, which apart from God's grace in Christ might well drive us to despair. This is saving faith—that humble, penitent and obedient response we make to God's gracious dealing with us, by which we are recreated in His image and grow up in His Kingdom. And it is the divine reality, the living God Himself, thus revealed to us and thus re-creating and remoulding us of whom Jesus speaks when He says—'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free'.

John xiv. 1-20: A Meditation¹

BY PROFESSOR DR. HELMUT KOESTER, HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U.S.A.

THIS passage appears to begin with a clear and wonderful assurance that is easy to grasp. But with each succeeding verse, it throws us back into one difficulty after another.

Jesus says that He is going to prepare a place for us in His Father's house. This embodies the hope of all mankind to be embraced by a definite security—if not in this world, then in the hereafter. And it assures us who believe in these words that we are those who will share this security. Only one thing seems to be necessary in order to participate: to know the way; to know the rules, the sacred formulæ, institutions, and acts which will teach us the way and ensure that we get there safely.

However, the answer given to our question voiced by Philip is disappointing. Jesus says: 'the way and the truth and the life—it is I'. This is not an easy answer. It does not give us an easy formula. For the question remains: Who is it, who says 'it is I'? A Man whose only glory was to be glorified upon the Cross.

Ah, but perhaps there may be a way to produce evidence that it is really He who is the way into heaven. Surely, there must be some definite proof that it is precisely this way—even if such an unattractive way as the way of the Cross—which is the way we are to go. If only there be some scholarly evidence, or theological doctrine at least, or perhaps a mysterious revelation. If God Himself will speak up for Jesus and for His glory on the Cross—'show us the Father'—then we, in spite of all, may be helped to go this way, reassured and without doubts. If only this Jesus could show us God as the One who approves of the Man on the Cross as the Way.

But the answer again is very disappointing: 'He who has seen Me has seen the Father'. Thus, again we are left with nothing but this Man Jesus.

Who is this Jesus? And how do we believe Him?

There are two things our text does not do. Firstly, it does not point to the Resurrection as a fact that approves of Jesus' way to the Cross as the divine way into eternity. And, it does not point to a sacred tradition, written or unwritten, in which all things are said definitely and once

for all. On the contrary, it answers our question 'who is He?' in such a way that it points to the words, to the works, and to the love.

His words—and our words;

His works—and our works;

His love—and our love.

These all are things which are beyond the undoubted and objective statement of facts, and beyond the easy assurance which knows no problem. The approved tradition cannot be doubted; but the proclamation calls for a decision which means involvement in the insecurities and doubts of life. The institutional cultic procedure stands firmly in itself; but the works which men, and even ministers, priests, and scholars do are bound to failure and error and misunderstanding. The firmly regulated way of life is unproblematic and secure; but love is never sure of itself, since it asks a man to give up himself and to break through the conventions and sign-posts which make life easy and clear.

If we are thrown back to the words and the works and the love, we have nothing but ourselves, our problems, our inabilities, our shortcomings—and, even worse, our pride, our abilities, and our achievements. And on the other hand, we have nothing but this Man Jesus of Nazareth proclaimed as the true way—which is His way to the Cross. And, finally, we have nothing but these writings about Jesus, which are rather problematic in themselves and which are a part of the very problem we are trying to understand.

However, we have a promise. We are not left alone as orphans. The Spirit of Truth will lead us into the truth itself. How does this happen? Certainly the Spirit does not come as a *deus ex machina* which gives us the mystic key to all difficulties; but as the realization of the truth within the things with which we are concerned.

It is the promise that Jesus will be present in this Spirit to open our eyes, if we apply ourselves totally to the relentless inquiry into the Scriptures and His words, to the merciless doubt concerning the security built up in our work, and to the self-sacrificing love that does not seek its own edification and joy. Here, and nowhere else, the heavenly place prepared for us by Jesus will become true and real—not for those who have already arrived, but for those who are willing to be justified by doubt, questions, and insecurity.

¹ Given at the General Meeting at St. Andrews on 7th September, 1961, of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas.

The Relation between Religion and Philosophy

BY PROFESSOR NELS F. S. FERRÉ, ANDOVER NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL,
NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.

RELIGION and philosophy are historic powers within the academic community. Certainly both religion and philosophy reach out beyond academic life. In their generality they centre in humanity's need to worship and to know; they are, indeed, coeval with man's thinking. But our concern now is with their place and function in higher education. The relation between them in our day is exceptionally critical. We are in the midst of a basic re-evaluation of this relation on the part of both philosophy and religion. For our comfort we may recall the saying that on the whole the unstable ages are the most creative.

The approach of our analysis is simple. We shall address ourselves first to the classical task of philosophy and then show how fundamentally shaken this view of philosophy is by contemporary thinking. After that we shall discuss the classical task of religion and indicate how beset this, too, is by modern thought. Finally we shall propose a relationship that we hope will preserve the heart of the historical tasks while also being fully open to their transformation in the light of current criticism.

I

The classical task of philosophy is the interpretation of man's experience as a whole. Philosophy has been concerned with rational knowledge in its totality. It has carried on its work within three emphases: (1) the empirical task, shared with science; (2) the analytical task, its distinctive responsibility; and (3) the contextual task, shared with religion. Philosophy has always been engaged in factual knowing, symbolized by correspondence; in logical investigation, symbolized by consistency; in the evaluative and interpretative organizing of experience, symbolized by coherence. The threefold task of philosophy has comprised the understanding of fact, form, and meaning for life. The main drive of philosophy, as its history amply attests, has been integrative of these three areas of knowledge.

The modern challenges to classical philosophy are basically two. Linguistic analysis has torn asunder the classical assumption of the identity of being and meaning that was the presupposition of philosophical inquiry from Parmenides to Hume and Kant. The main line of attack on the part

of linguistic analysis is clear. Knowledge is either analytical and necessary or empirical and contingent. Philosophy deals properly with propositional meaning. The inquiry for concrete fact has been pre-empted by science. Philosophy is methodologically in no position to compete with science and should recognize this fact. Metaphysics, or the contextual task of philosophy, is illegitimate in that it is neither analytical nor properly empirical. It is neither a matter of analysis of meaning nor capable of public verification in the realm of fact. Therefore, it is not properly knowledge.

Modern philosophy, for a large and strong part, has taken as its frame of reference and its attitudinal stance that knowledge is analytical validation or empirical verification and therefore, leaving the empirical realm of inquiry to science, it has rigidly delimited the field of philosophy to the analysis of meaning. By so doing this section of modern philosophy has abandoned the main tasks of classical philosophy, at least in the approach to them. It seems thereby to have dismantled and even denuded the classical function of philosophy. We shall consider later whether or not this charge is true.

Classical philosophy has also been attacked by depth psychology. Attainable objectivity is a presupposition for methodological adequacy on the part of classical philosophy. Depth psychology has stressed as fact the idea that why we say something is more important than what we say. Reason, it holds, is rationalization of self-interest. It is pressured out of focus by dominant drives of self-interest or group will. It has here, incidentally, echoed the charge by Christian interpreters to the effect that sinful man cannot think objectively concerning God. Man is not free to choose sides from within some morally and spiritually neutral territory but is driven from within. Classical philosophy could dismiss the Christian charge as religious bias, but depth psychology claims to be a secular and even a scientific subject.

It may not be out of place to observe in passing that such assault on classical objectivity cuts in several directions. Both secular and religious thinkers can see how easily reason can become a dodge from reality. Thus, for instance, naturalistic reductionism, especially in the form of mechanistic determinism, can be seen as ideology

not science, whereby man fled from the responsibility of personal and social choice. The Christian thinker will claim that the flight was not only from freedom but from God. When modern science itself broke through the ironclad jacket of continuity and discovered an open universe, man had to find a new city of refuge from freedom and from God. Either depth psychology declaring religion to be projective rationalization or a new theory of logic ruling the religious question out of bounds would do. Depth psychology, at least in certain forms, and philosophic meaninglessness may both be constructs of protective ideology!

II

The classical task of religion has been twofold : (1) to know and to accept ultimate reality ; (2) to find what is the ultimate good and to do what is ultimately right.

To-day words about religion fail to communicate because of rapidly changing usage and mood. We use 'ultimate reality' as the determinative focus of classical religion because the term is itself classical. Definitions of religion may be either too narrow or too wide. Herbert Farmer in his Gifford Lectures has defined religion in terms of the supreme personal Being. He may be right. Such may be the truest ultimate religious reference. But have we the right to rule out Buddhism and high Hinduism, for instance, as religious? And what of men like Bultmann and Tillich who feel that as modern men they can no longer hold the classical Christian confession of the personal God? Must we even rule out as religious men like Jaspers and Heidegger?

Perhaps, on the other hand, Tillich's definition that religion is what concerns us ultimately or unconditionally is too broad, if taken by itself. It is significantly a recognition that religion is man's response to what is ultimate ; but may it not be necessary to specify that religion, even interpretatively, can never be limited to man's experience but is always a matter of both the realities and powers that go beyond man's ordinary experience? Tillich's own view of religion goes beyond his definition. Somehow, however, the classical definition of religion in terms of depth reality as contrasted with modern man's definition in terms of depth dimension may spell out at the centre the present attack on classical faith.

The second main task of religion is to find what is ultimately good and to do what is ultimately right. Religion is never a mere matter of knowledge. Religion always specializes in worship. Contact with numinous and charismatic reality is the heart of religion. It never seeks truth for truth's sake ; that is the realm of philosophy ;

it always seeks truth for the sake of salvation. Religion also issues in life. It includes conduct. Worship, search for salvation, and conduct are irreducibly constitutive aspects of the classical understanding of religion as these were all viewed and lived in the light and power of ultimate reality.

The modern challenge to classical religion comes from recent philosophy and from depth psychology. From the point of linguistic analysis it is charged that God as necessary being is a contradiction in terms. The term 'necessary' has analytical validity exclusively. 'Being' refers to existence which can never be more than probably known. No knowledge of being can therefore be necessary. To make the statement 'necessary being' is to employ language without regard to its proper logical use. The affirmation that God is necessary being is logically meaningless. Some then add that since it is logically meaningless and since logic is our final arbiter of the correct usage of language, we can know by logic that God does not exist, or that there can be no necessary being.

Another accusation against classical religion is that we cannot logically interpret the whole. God is by definition the category of the whole, no matter how the whole is then understood. Therefore we cannot know, we cannot meaningfully refer to God. The reason that we cannot deal with the whole is that we as interpreters are either inside or outside the whole. If we are inside we cannot see it as a whole. If we are outside, the whole is no longer whole. For that matter, how can knowledge of the whole be verified? Certainly there are neither analytical nor empirical ways of testing such knowledge. Nor can knowledge of the whole be falsified by anything. Therefore religious knowledge dealing with the whole is meaningless.

The second main charge against classical religion comes from depth psychology. It is in fact basically the same charge as that levelled against classical philosophy. Religion, the accusation reads, is the rationalization of our human predicament. There is no objectively existing God in whose image we are made. We make God, as a father substitute, as a cosmic protector, in our own image. We project our dreams and wishes or we objectify the deeper structures of the self. To understand well enough the nature and struggle of man is to account for his gods. If religion is to deal with reality, on this view, it must shed its classical superstructure and become revolutionized in terms of man's own inner life.

III

The relation between religion and philosophy which I am to propose is symbiotic ; it is symbiotic

in co-operation through conflict. It has been said that we should count our best friend our strongest enemy. A friend is honest with us and constructively critical, despising self-centered flattery or avoidance of problems. Let us look first at religion, in the order of a debate, and then finish with philosophy where we started. The answers to the charges made will then come, not within false ways of asking the questions, but within the proper setting of both religion and philosophy. We shall name five central characteristics of religion.

A. (1) Religion is existential. Religion can never become either philosophy or science without forfeiting its own nature. Religion certainly cannot claim necessary knowledge in the logical sense without surrendering its distinctive categories like freedom, sin, and grace. Therefore it can never be verified or falsified like a science, except possibly eschatologically, or in the final solution beyond our control. Nor can religion have scientific knowledge without repudiating not only the subjective experience but also the objective import of faith. God cannot be proved by experience and history any more than He can be proved by mere reason. The ultimate cannot be proved by the proximate. Kierkegaard has put us all in his debt at this point.

Yet we must all take a stance. We must live by some presupposition. Religion is not optional. Faith is inescapable for finite beings. Religion is situational. As total selves we must choose concerning both what concerns us ultimately, the subjective decision, and what in fact is ultimate, the objective reality.

Subjectively there are many choices for persons and for cultures; objectively cosmic process puts three main choices before us: (a) what came first in process is most real and all else is somehow creative manifestations of it. Neutral prime stuff alone is permanently real. (b) The process as it now is gives us the best picture of reality. We should try to understand it as best we can with its good and evil, with its failures and future possibilities. (c) What is to come in line with the highest appearance in human history best indicates the nature of the cosmic process. Human history itself in cosmic time is blitz-emergence. The highest event in it that affords the most explanatory and organizing power for the rest of process most truly indicates the nature of the process.

All these choices can be put in different ways, but they are central. Among them we do in fact choose by what we make concretely central in the configuration of our lives. Existentialism most deeply means that life is continually personal choice of faith but faith concerning the whole nature of the world as we meet it. In this sense

the whole is no speculative question but an inescapable burden of decision for every person.

(2) The existential nature of religion leads right into its organismic nature. When we respond as entire beings to the totality of the world as it meets us in our experience, we shape this world in our thought and life even while we are the more shaped by that world. We respond to a world sufficiently unified to be called a universe. Everything in that universe is related intimately or ultimately, directly or indirectly. The separation of form from fact, of intellect from existence, of logic from empirical categories is intellectualistic. They are together in experience before they are thought apart. This fact we shall consider in its full significance with respect to philosophy in our next section, but even here it is obvious that it is a major mistake. Religion is not only existential but through and through organismic.

(3) Religion is also dialectical. It lives both by faith beyond itself and by reason around itself. It lives by faith and by knowledge in dynamic interaction. There is a dimension of the Word of God and a dimension of the world. There is the normative context of revelation and the descriptive content of the actual world. Somehow these two dimensions must be worked into life and truth. Faith generates the creative reason while knowledge generates the critical reason. Sturdy faith is a growing dialectic between creative faith and critical reason.

(4) Religion is mostly a matter of concrete community. When intellectualism takes over, religion dies. Religion is born in the tent of revelation, not in the cloistered study. The concrete community of faith depends on the seer and the prophet, not on the philosopher. Philosophy is always a damper on faith, useful as a challenge and a check, hurtful when made the final criterion of religious truth. This may be the reason that when systematic theology becomes basically philosophical rather than Biblical it undermines faith. Philosophical theology is part of the critical and not the creative reason. Religion is strong only within the life and presuppositions of the concrete community of faith.

(5) Finally, religion is eschatological. It centres in the end, be it heaven or nirvana. Religion is life in the light of the ultimate. Whatever end that ultimate provides determines the whole life of religion. The ending, of whatever nature, determines the ends of life. If classical religion were to be verified or falsified it would have to be so only eschatologically. Since we cannot now know the end time or end situation, we might have to settle for some such suggestion as the need for the most exceptional attainment that would most fully exemplify the true potential of all

worshippers. The unique is paradoxically the universal, made possible only by the fact that human nature can be 'subversively' fulfilled. It can be transformed according to its deepest nature best shown in the most exceptional instance of attainment and contradicted by the ordinary appearance and expectations concerning general attainment. In any case, classical religion is eschatological. The crux of validation can come only in that the highest realization in the exceptional instance must be generally realizable.

B. As we turn to discuss philosophy we should first of all be thankful that this discipline is returning to its distinctive task. (1) Philosophy deals basically with meaning, not with fact nor with salvation. Fact is the province of science; salvation is the domain of religion. When philosophy enters these realms it does so only as a consultant with regard to the correct use of reason. There is need for philosophy in all realms of knowledge, but philosophy cannot become science and compete with science in the area of fact; neither can it become religion and substitute for religion in the order of saving truth. The data for science and for religion are provided within the two fields respectively and when philosophy tries to become one science among many or one religion among many it prostitutes its distinctive task. What it can do, in so far as the philosopher is capable of ample enough empathy, is to examine the way reason is used with respect to fact or with respect to experience.

(2) Philosophy can no more be a metaphysics than a science or a religion. A rational metaphysics is impossible. Every metaphysics is a faith stance. We are not denying secondary objectivity to reason. Our point is not that every interpreter is involved in all ultimate interpretations. Such is the case, but man can still transcend his involvement sufficiently to think beyond it in spite of both finitude and sin. If this were not the case all religions and all configurations of life, as a matter of fact, would be purely arbitrary.

Then, indeed, the charge of depth psychology is true. But then depth psychology is equally subject to such a charge and can be taken as nothing but ideology with reference to ultimates. Already psychologists of standing are beginning to name some of its forms fads like mesmerism. Neither religion nor philosophy should disregard the facts and the interpretations of depth psychology, but both should be secure enough to see its charge in perspective as falsely condemnatory of all life of reason in its high and holy calling. The problem is, rather, to be open to the understanding of the true facts that depth psychology has helped bring to light, like rationalization and

the abuses of the life of reason generally. Our claim that every metaphysics is a faith stance springs, then, not from any denial of reason's proper objectivity, but, rather, from the fact that within process there is no conclusive evidence as to the nature of process.

Every ethics is also a faith stance. There is no fully provable rational ethics. An ethics without presupposition is impossible. Every ethical configuration involves metaphysical implications. Rationally responsible conduct, stemming from a concrete person or community, has a context of conduct as well as content of conduct. That context is in the final analysis a faith stance.

(3) But philosophy can criticize creatively the method and contexts involved in the finding, establishing, and interpreting of facts. There is such a field as the philosophy of science with directive as well as descriptive powers. Philosophy can also criticize creatively both contexts and evaluations in history, art, and literature. History, of course, stands as both an art and a science subject to the respective two kinds of appraisal. Philosophy can also review, for consistency of thought and applicability to established fact, such attempts at whole interpretation as are provided for it either by its own creative reason or by other intellectual approaches. Such examination is not a seeing of the whole as God sees it, which would be a fantastic attempt, but the viewing of the whole from finite foci with awareness not only of man's finitude and sin but also of the mind's power for evaluative appraisal before and after choice, similar to the delayed response which constitutes the heart of thinking. Such secondary weighing of evidence can never take the place of the forced decisions of freedom with respect to the nature of the ultimate, but it can deliver man from total irresponsibility and arbitrariness in the matter of faith.

Thus philosophy, without ever becoming religion, can criticize faith stances in relation to fact, inner consistency, and contextual adequacy in relation to religion. To say that philosophy cannot deal with any combination of necessity and being is arbitrarily to create a chasm in man's knowledge at the very centre of his need for meaning. Such action is arbitrary because analytical thinking and factual being are in fact together within the interpreter before they are abstracted apart as theory. Since they are thus together in the thinker the most that can be said for any knowledge of necessity even analytically is that we cannot know necessity necessarily. Such a statement tallies with the theologian's understanding that we cannot know any absolute absolutely or that there is always a relative aspect of man's knowledge of God.

Man's very centre of need for meaning, moreover, is with relation to reason's use in the field of social, political, and religious choices. Neither exact mathematics nor strict science can give us directives in these areas of thought for life. To banish reason from these realms is to abandon man to the hucksters of superstitious faith and to the charlatans of social life. Although final faith judgments are inescapable by virtue of man's nature and situation within cosmic process, nevertheless we must take every advantage of the proper use of reason. The fact that in certain realms of life we cannot know with the same degree of objective certainty as in others does not mean that we must therefore surrender these realms to sheer subjectivity. Faith walks best seeing. True meaning never hides ultimate mystery. It steers faith toward the light that it can neither attain nor contain.

Philosophy, then, has as its distinctive task analysis. Its central field is meaning. But it is also symbiotic in nature. It cannot take the

place of science, history, aesthetics, ethics, or religion. These are contents with which it must deal. But it can serve as the friendly critic. Theology and philosophy should be disciplines of co-operation. We reiterate that they should be symbiotic as friendly enemies, not to avoid conflict, for religion needs the checking and challenging criticism of philosophy with respect to its claims of faith. Faith matures and is enlightened, yes, changed, by its learning from valid and adequate knowledge.

Philosophy, for its part, needs the drive and wholeness of creative faith to give unity and importance to life, work, and civilization. Let there be no false, sentimental friendship, but neither let there be conflict that is unconcerned with the need and truth of faith as man's fullest contact with reality and his most dynamic context for life. Let philosophy do its most critical work with concern, and let religion find the faith that fulfils, rather than frustrates, man's need for integrity even in knowledge.

Contributions and Comments

1 Corinthians xiii. 13

νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη, τὰ
τρία ταῦτα, μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη.

THE new translation reads—'In a word, there are three things that last for ever: faith, hope, and love; but the greatest of them all is love'. But does this adequately convey the Apostle's thought?

A visitor to our local Ministers' Fraternal recently suggested that Paul is occasionally incorrect and careless in his statements, as here. Faith does not last for ever, nor does hope, while love does. There comes a time for the believer when faith is no longer necessary, for he has reached the beatitude of God's presence; and when hope ceases because the believer has realized the end of all his hopes. Faith and hope are, therefore, temporary, and not eternal. But does Paul say that faith and hope and love last for ever? I suggest not.

The sentence starts with νυνὶ, now, in this present time—more emphatic than νυν alone. He has just written ἄρτι . . . τότε δὲ, 'for now . . . but then . . .', and again, ἄρτι . . . τότε δὲ, 'now . . . but then . . .'. He is contrasting 'now' and 'hereafter'. And so, he writes νυνὶ δὲ μένει . . ., changing from ἄρτι to νυνὶ which are synonymous. (See Abbott-Smith, *Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*.)

The meaning would then seem to be, not that faith, hope and love last for ever, but that these are three qualities most essential, that man needs now, in this very present.

F. VERNON MOSS

Loughborough

The Burning Bush

As an Anglican I hesitate to offer to teach a Presbyterian (even an Irish one) anything about the Church of Scotland; but when Dr. Wilson suggests (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxxiii. [October, 1961] 30) that the motto *Nec tamen . . . consumebatur* (which, he rightly says, and I had not realised it, comes from Tremellius's translation) refers, not to persecution but to the divine presence, he might like to have his attention drawn to Tremellius's own marginal note about the Bush:

'An emblem of Moses in affliction and exile, and of the Israelite Church in the furnace or crucible of Egypt assayed but not consumed' (*figura Moschis afflicti exsulis, et Ecclesiae Jisraelitarum in Aegypto, tamquam in fornace catinove probatae, sed non consumtae: ut sequentibus exponitur, et Deuter. 4.20*).

GEORGE RUST

Southampton

Recent Foreign Theology

Jesus in the Koran. With the desire of helping to create a climate of mutual understanding between Christians and Muslims, Professor H. Michaud surveys the references to Jesus in the Koran.¹ He shows that Muhammad recognized that Jesus had a miraculous birth, and that He was a Word of God, but betrays a Docetic view of the death of Christ. His knowledge of Jesus, M. Michaud says, reached him through the deforming prism of Greek thought, and while he esteemed Him highly, there are notable negations of the Christian view. In particular, the Koran knows Jesus only as a man, since its conception of the unity of God would allow no more. The purpose of this study is not propaganda, but understanding, and the author appeals for Muslim scholars to undertake a comparable study of the Christian view of Jesus, provided it is not conducted in the rationalist spirit of Ghazali.

Bible and Koran. A little book in Dutch, by J. Jomier, deals more generally with the Bible and the Koran.² Here a single chapter is devoted to Jesus in the Koran, and the author deals more widely with the knowledge of the Bible accessible to Muhammad, and the links of idea and outlook common to the Bible and the Koran. The reader is given a short account of what the Koran is, and there are chapters on Islamic law, brotherhood, apocalyptic, and a number of other subjects. As in the above-mentioned work, the author writes with a sympathetic understanding of the Islamic faith, and underlines the striking points of connexion between the two faiths, with the aim of promoting discussion between their followers. The Ecumenical Movement is bringing many groups of Christians together for mutual understanding rather than conflict, and here the ecumenical spirit of our time is reaching out more widely. It is particularly interesting to find this spirit in the above-mentioned Protestant work and in this Roman Catholic work.

Dutch Bible Studies. The first five of a Roman Catholic series of little Dutch books, with the general title of 'The Teaching of the Bible on . . . ' have appeared. The first is by B. M. F. van Iersel, on *The Living God*;³ the second is by

¹ *Jésus selon le Coran* (*Cahiers Théologiques*, 46) [1960]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel; Swiss Fr. 5.50.

² *Bijbel en Koran* [1960]. Romen en Zonen, Roermond; Fl. 6.50.

³ *De Bijbel over de levende God*.

K. H. Schelkle, on *Mary*;⁴ the third is by Fr. Stier, on *The History of Salvation*;⁵ the fourth is by J. Heuschen, on *The Ascension*;⁶ and the fifth is by L. Hermans, on *The Birth and Youth of Jesus*.⁷ The first offers a simple account of the Biblical doctrine of God, the second a review of the references to Mary in the New Testament, the third a survey of the Divine leading and disciplining of Israel in the Old Testament and of the establishment of the New Covenant in the New, the fourth a study of the New Testament account of the Ascension, with an examination of liberal criticism, and a study of allusions to the ascended Christ throughout the New Testament, and the fifth an examination of the birth narratives of the First and Third Gospels. All are naturally written from the Roman standpoint, and the series is a fresh indication of the revival of Roman Catholic interest in the Bible.

Râs Shamra and the Old Testament. Attention has for some years been diverted from the Râs Shamra texts by the Dead Sea Scrolls. Professor E. Jacob has returned to these texts, which aroused so much interest thirty years ago, and has published a small, well-illustrated book in the series of archaeological studies edited by André Parrot,⁸ in which he examines the significance of these texts for the study of the Old Testament. There is a short account of the discoveries and of the history of Ugarit—the ancient name of Râs Shamra—followed by an outline of the contents of the religious texts, with a final section on the meaning for the student of the Old Testament. Some interesting examples are given to show how valuable these texts are to throw light on the meaning of passages of the Bible which have been obscure, or which have been misunderstood, and the author evaluates the light they shed on the history of the Israelites and on the religion of the Canaanites, which so often infiltrated into the popular religion of Israel. He rejects the more extreme theory of the link with Israelite history which was advanced soon after the early

⁴ *De Bijbel over Maria*.

⁵ *De Bijbel over de heilsgeschiedenis*.

⁶ *De Bijbel over hemelvaart*.

⁷ *De Bijbel over Jezus' geboorte en jeugd*. All were published in 1960 by Romen en Zonen, Roermond; Fl. 2.90 per volume, or by subscription Fl. 2.65 per volume.

⁸ *Râs Shamra et l'Ancien Testament* (*Cahiers d'Archéologie Biblique*, 12) [1960]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel.

discoveries, but finds a historical element in the Keret text, following the view of de Vaux and others. Altogether, this is an excellent little work of popularization.

The Qumrân Scrolls. Despite the great variety of views on the Dead Sea Scrolls which have been propounded, it is still possible to put forward another. Professor Rengstorf has issued a book on *Khirbet Qumrân and the Library from the Dead Sea*,¹ in which he disputes the widely held Essene view of the owners of the Scrolls, and advances the view that the so-called monastery was really a branch of the Temple library, and that the Scrolls were a part of the Temple collection. The author is very learned, and asks many acute questions, but it is doubtful if his view will establish itself. The Essene view is admittedly a hypothesis, and it has been challenged by others on quite different grounds. It rests on the impressive measure of correspondence between what we are told about the Essenes by first-century writers and what we read in the non-Biblical Qumrân texts, which appear either to come from members of a closely related sect, or to consist of literature germane to their interests. The Temple library might have been expected to yield records, such as do not figure here at all.

Cullmann's Peter. The important work of Professor Oscar Cullman on *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, which appeared in German in 1952—dedicated to Manchester University—and which has already been translated into English, does not need to be described here. Some readers may be interested to know that a new and enlarged edition has now appeared in German,² in which the author takes account of the discussions that followed the publication of the previous edition and embodies the fruits of his own continued studies on aspects of the subject.

Eichrodt's Old Testament Theology. Nearly twenty years ago I referred in a book I published to the growing interest in Old Testament theology. An American reviewer caustically remarked that this might be true in the corner of Wales where I then lived, but it was certainly not true in America. Since then books offering a Theology of the Old Testament have appeared in plenty in Europe and America, though no British author has yet added one to their number. The first of the major

modern books on this subject was written by Professor W. Eichrodt, of Basel, and its first part appeared in 1933, and it was one of the evidences of a growing interest in the subject that I had in mind when I wrote, though it did not seem to have reached the fastnesses of America from which my reviewer wrote a decade after it had appeared. It has gone through several editions, and now the fourth edition of parts 2 and 3 has been issued.³ This is substantially revised, particularly in certain sections, and the volume is appreciably longer than the original edition. That it continues to be called for is evidence that it has not been superseded by the works that have followed it. While several of the books on this subject have valuable features, there is none more penetrating and profound than Eichrodt's.

Faith and History in the Old Testament. Volumes of collected essays by a single author are much in vogue to-day. Articles which have appeared in a variety of journals, not always easily accessible and sometimes out of print, are conveniently gathered together and given a new and welcome availability. Among such recent volumes is one consisting of a baker's dozen of articles by Professor Artur Weiser, published under the title *Faith and History in the Old Testament*.⁴ The dates of the original publication of the papers range from 1923 to 1955. The one that gives its title to the volume appeared as a monograph in 1931. The final paper, on Faith in the Old Testament, is an extract from Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch*. In addition, there are essays on the problem of the moral ordering of the world in the Book of Job, on the significance of the Old Testament for Religious Education, on religion and morality in Genesis, on the theological task of Old Testament scholarship, on 1 S 15, on the story of Paradise and the Fall, on the theological understanding of the Old Testament, on Ps 77, on the understanding of the Old Testament, on the question of the relation between the Psalter and the Cult, and on the so-called Baruch biography of Jeremiah. Many will be glad to have these valuable papers, with their dominant interest in the theology of the Old Testament, within the covers of a single volume.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester

¹ *Hirbet Qumrân und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer* [1960]. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

² *Petrus, Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer* [1961]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Swiss Fr. 24.

³ *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Teil 2/3 [1961]. Ehrenfried Klotz, Stuttgart.

⁴ *Glaube und Geschichte im Alten Testament* [1961]. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen; DM 24.00, or bound 28.00.

Entre Nous

Other Religions

When the Army classifies a man's religion, when it gets beyond the great historic manifestations of the Faith, it classifies all other manifestations of religion under the comprehensive grouping of 'other religions'. These 'other religions' are notably strong to-day. Two very useful books about them have just appeared. The first is a new book, *Dangerous Delusions*, by the Rev. Kenneth N. Ross (Mowbray; 4s. 6d. net); the second is a republication of an expanded and brought up-to-date version of Professor Horton Davies' *Christian Deviations: The Challenge of the Sects* as an S.C.M. paperback (S.C.M.; 5s. net). Both these books are very useful indeed, and between them they deal with Christian Science, Spiritualism, Theosophy, Mormonism, British Israel, Seventh-Day Adventism, Jehovah's Witnesses, Pentecostalism, Moral Re-armament, and Astrology.

The growth of these sects does in fact constitute one of the major religious phenomena of the present day. There are to-day in Great Britain twenty thousand Mormons in sixty-five churches; in 1960 there were five thousand baptisms of Mormon believers in Britain, and the Mormons have embarked on a building programme in Britain which includes fifty new churches. In 1950 there were two hundred and twenty-five thousand Seventh Day Adventists; in 1960 there were three hundred and five thousand. In the United States there were a hundred and twenty-six thousand Spiritualists; in 1960 there were a hundred and seventy-five thousand. Between 1942 and 1952 the numbers of Jehovah's Witnesses doubled in North America, multiplied fifteen times in South America, twelve times in the Atlantic islands, five times in Asia, seven times in Europe and Africa, six times in the Pacific islands. Their monthly periodical 'The Watchtower' has now a sale of three million copies a month and is printed in forty-six different languages. There is no doubt at all of the challenge to the Church.

There is equally no doubt that the rapid spread of these sects is in very large part due to the missionary enthusiasm and efficiency of their ordinary members. In the Mormon Church, as Professor Horton Davies relates, 'Every member in good standing and in good health is expected to venture on a two-year missionary journey at his own expense for travel and maintenance to whatever part of the world he may be sent from the headquarters at Salt Lake City, Utah'. The

result of this is that the Mormon Church has over seven thousand five hundred missionaries in the field, and expects in the near future to attain a total of twelve thousand missionaries. Here is a church in which the ideal is that every member should be a missionary. Every Jehovah's Witness must do some 'publishing', as Mr. Ross relates, and pioneers give at least one hundred hours a month to such canvassing. Churches whose members are so devoted to the service of their church are bound to grow.

One of the extraordinary features of these sects is their ability to survive the idiosyncracies and worse of their founders and of those who are prominent in them. Mary Baker Eddy's matrimonial adventures were not altogether successful, and in 1877 she married a disciple, Asa Eddy, and gave her age on the marriage certificate as forty when she was in fact fifty-five. Mr. Ross provides evidence that the Christian Science authorities have again and again deliberately suppressed lives of Mary Baker Eddy, even to the extent of buying up and presumably destroying the plates. Helena Blavatsky was demonstrably a fraud in the matter of the reception of alleged letters from the so-called Hidden Master Koot Hoomi of Tibet. Her defence was that you could do nothing else since 'in order to rule men, you must deceive them'. The consistent misfiring of the prophecies of Jehovah's Witnesses about the date of the end of the world has apparently not discredited them. Judge Rutherford's conduct was notorious; his wife divorced him for alleged misconduct with female members of his church and to avoid paying alimony he transferred his £60,000 fortune to *The Watchtower and Tract Society* which he controlled, while his sale of 'Miracle Wheat' at \$60 a bushel to credulous farmers was something which the American legal authorities stepped in and stopped as fraudulent.

The existence and the growth and the vitality of these sects are the signs of a hunger in the heart of men for God. They constitute at one and the same time a rebuke and a challenge to the Church. These two little books will be found of very great value to those who wish information about the sects in a handy and accurate form.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.